

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

CONTENTS

SCHOLTE, J. H.—Grimmelshausens Anteil an der sprachlichen Gestalt der ältesten Simplicissimusdrucke,	65
LANCASTER, H. CARRINGTON.—Two Letters written by Racine to his Sister,	74
MOORE, SAMUEL.—Lawrence Minot,	78
WHITFORD, R. C.—On the Origin of the "Probationary Odes for the Laureatship,"	81
SMART, WALTER K.—William Lichfield and his "Complaint of God,"	85
OSGOOD, CHARLES G.—The 'Doleful Lay of Clorinda,'	90
PANCOAST, HENRY S.—Shelley's "Ode to the West Wind,"	97

Reviews:—

C. H. GRANDGENT, The Power of Dante. [J. E. Shaw.]	101
ELIZABETH S. TYLER, <i>La Chanson de Willame</i> . [Lucy M. Gay.]	108
ROBERT C. HOLLIDAY, Joyce Kilmer: Poems, Essays, and Letters. [J. W. Tupper.]	112

Correspondence:—

CLOUGH, BEN. C.—Notes on the Metaphysical Poets,	115
CLOUGH, BEN. C.—"Full Many a Gem,"	117
CHEW, SAMUEL C.—Swinburne's Contributions to <i>The Spectator</i> in 1862,	118
BRERETON, J. LE ROY.—One-Door Interiors on the Elizabethan Stage,	119
BROOKE, TUCKER.—Elizabethan 'Nocturnal' and 'Infernal' Plays,	120
MEAD, GILBERT W.—Kipling and Ariosto,	121

Brief Mention:—

M. A. BAYFIELD, The Measures of the Poets: A New System of English Prosody;—PERCY H. BOYNTON, American Poetry;—FLORENCE M. GRIMM, Astronomical Lore in Chaucer,	122
---	-----

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Sixty-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with inter-
mission from July to October (inclusive)

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to aesthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is
\$5.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada \$5.25
and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French Department to H. Carrington Lancaster; for the Italian and Spanish Departments to Gustav Gruenbaum. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.

Oxford Russian Plain Texts

New Series under the general editorship of NEVILL FORBES.

Cr. 8vo. (7 $\frac{3}{8}$ x 5), limp cloth.

Leo Tolstóy. A Prisoner of the Caucasus; edited by E. G. Underwood. Pp. 64. 50 c.

Turgénev. Pegasus, Biryúk, Forest and Steppe: edited by Nevill Forbes and E. G. Underwood. Pp. 56. 50 c.

Dostoéovski. A Christmas-Tree and a Wedding, An Honest Thief; edited by Nevill Forbes. Pp. 64. 50 c.

Gógol. An Old-World Country-House: edited by Nevill Forbes. Pp. 64. 50 c.

Púshkin. The Queen of Spades: edited by Nevill Forbes and E. G. Underwood. Pp. 64. 50 c.

Goncharóv's *Mea-Servants of Other Days*, edited by Nevill Forbes. Pp. 80. 60 c.

Krilóv: Select Fables, edited by E. G. Underwood, Pp. 64.

Saltykov's Pilgrims and Wayfarers, Bygone Times, ed. by Nevill Forbes. Pp. 80. 60 c.

Lermontov: Select Poems. Edited by Nevill Forbes, Pp. 64. 55 c.



OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

American Branch

35 WEST 32ND STREET, NEW YORK



MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXV

FEBRUARY, 1920

NUMBER 2

GRIMMELSHAUSENS ANTEIL AN DER SPRACHLICHEN GESTALT DER AELTESTEN SIMPLICISSIMUSDRUCKE

Der *Simplicissimus*, das lebensfrische Bild der verwilderten Zustände während des Dreißigjährigen Krieges, ist nicht bloß literarisch und kulturhistorisch wertvoll, auch als rein sprachliches Denkmal verdient er die Aufmerksamkeit der Philologen. Zum Teil versteht sich das von selbst. Ein Werk, dem sprachliche Vorzüge fehlen, kommt nicht oder nur höchst vereinzelt, zu literarischer oder auch nur zu historischer Geltung. Hier tritt aber noch ein ganz spezieller Umstand hinzu. Außer den schriftstellerischen Vorzügen von Grimmelshausens Sprache und Stil, die ihm eine hervorragende Stellung unter den deutschen Prosaisten früherer Jahrhunderte sichern, lassen sich an dem *Simplicissimus* eigentümliche sprachliche Erscheinungen beobachten, da dieses Werk in den verschiedenen Ausgaben die Einflüsse bestimmter Sprachtendenzen in lebendiger Anwendung aufweist. Ähnlich wie der Archaeologe aus der Zusammensetzung der Erdschichten in ihrer Vermischung mit menschlichen Kulturelementen auf Bildungszustände einer längst vergangenen Epoche schließt, so läßt sich aus einer Vergleichung der *Simplicissimus*drucke eine Vorstellung der sich widerstreitenden, sprachbildenden Faktoren des Siebzehnten Jahrhunderts gewinnen. Wenn sich nämlich in zwei nahezu gleichzeitigen Drucken desselben Werkes bei genauer Vergleichung beobachten läßt, daß eine sprachliche Streitfrage systematisch in dem einen in einer, in dem anderen in entgegengesetzter Richtung entschieden wird, so geht daraus hervor, daß in der zwischen den beiden Drucken liegenden Zeitspanne sich in einem bestimmten Milieu ein Sieg mit Bezug auf diese schwankenden Anschauungen vollzogen hat.

Die sprachliche Bedeutung dieser Doppeldrucke trat zum ersten Mal richtig und scharf beleuchtet in den Gesichtskreis der Philologen, als Rudolf Kögel in den *Neudruckten deutscher Litteraturwerke des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts* den *Simplicissimus* herausgab (Halle a. S., 1880). Es war nicht die erste kritische Ausgabe dieses Werkes, auch nicht die beste, aber das sprachliche Problem wurde hier zum ersten Mal einwandfrei formuliert. Die beste kritische Ausgabe hatte zwanzig Jahre vor Kögel bereits Adelbert von Keller veröffentlicht (Stuttgart, Gedruckt auf Kosten des Litterarischen Vereins, 1854-62); sie ist bis heute noch nicht überholt worden. Aber das sprachliche Material, das er mit sorgsamem Fleiß und exemplarischer Genauigkeit aufspeicherte, ließ er weiter unbeachtet. Man muß wohl annehmen, daß die Schlußfolgerungen, die seine unermüdete Arbeit ihm zweifellos ermöglicht hätten, ihn nicht genügend reizten. Bei Heinrich Kurz, der ungefähr gleichzeitig die *Simplicianischen* Schriften einem größeren Leserkreis zugänglich machte (Leipzig 1863-64), war das offenbar anders. Er weist darauf hin, daß die eine Ausgabe meist starke Flexionsformen anwendet, während die andere schwache vorzieht, daß diese fortwährend die zusammengesetzten Konjunktionen durch Pronomina trennt (z. B. *ob ich zwar mich zweymal betrügen lassen, so gieng ich* usw.), während erstere die Konjunktionen ungetrennt läßt und die Pronomina nachsetzt (z. B. *obzwar ich mich zweymal betrügen lassen* usw.). Ihm fehlten aber zu sehr die grammatischen Kenntnisse dieses Sprachstandes, um die richtigen Schlußfolgerungen ziehen zu können, so daß er sich denn auch in der Charakterisierung der beiden Sprachtypen geradezu irrt und die Sprache in der Ausgabe, die wir in der Folge als die überarbeitete und normalisierte erkennen werden, durchaus dilettantisch als die "überhaupt bei weitem mehr das Gepräge des volkstümlichen Ausdrucks tragende" kennzeichnet. Dem fleißigen und für die Stoffgeschichte verdienstvollen Dilettanten und Sammler Heinrich Kurz steht Rudolf Kögel als der methodisch vorgehende Philologe gegenüber. Er charakterisiert den Sprachstand der beiden Doppeldrucke durchaus richtig, indem er von dem Druck mit den durch Pronomina getrennten Konjunktionen urteilt: "Wir haben hier noch fast durchaus echt volkstümliche Formen und Wendungen, ein Kleid, das dem Roman viel besser ansteht, als die modische Tracht der Schriftsprache." Nur schade, daß er in

engem Anschluß an Kurz die Druckverhältnisse selbst auf den Kopf stellt. Über diese Druckverhältnisse zunächst ein paar orientierende Worte.

Kurz hatte die Ausgabe, der er "das Gepräge des volkstümlichen Ausdrucks" zuerkannte, als die echte und rechtmäßige bezeichnet. Er entschied sich also in der Meinungsverschiedenheit, die Adelbert von Keller von seinem vieljährigen Mitarbeiter in den Angelegenheiten des Litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart, Wilhelm Ludwig Holland, trennt, für die Ansicht des letztern. Professor Holland hatte nämlich bereits im Jahre 1851 einen *Versuch einer Ausgabe nach den vier ältesten Drucken des Abenteuerlichen Simplicissimus* herausgegeben, dabei der auch von Kurz als rechtmäßig bezeichneten Ausgabe die Priorität zuerkannt und ihr in Übereinstimmung damit den Buchstaben A beigelegt. Es ist die Ausgabe unter folgendem Titel: *Neueingerichteter und vielverbesserter / Abenteuerlicher / Simplicissimus / Das ist: / Beschreibung deß Lebens eines sel- / tzamen Vaganten, genant Melchior Stern- / fels von Fuchshaim, wie, wo und welcher ge- / stalt Er nemlich in diese Welt kommen, was / er darin gesehen, gelernet, erfahren und auß- / gestanden, auch warum er solche wieder / freywillig quittiret hat. / Ueberauß lustig, und männiglich / nützlich zulesen. / An Tag geben / Von / German Schleifheim / von Sulsfort. / Mompelgart, / Gedruckt bey Johann Fillion, / Im Jahr M DC LXIX.*

Holland hatte dabei augenscheinlich übersehen, daß die Ausgabe, der er den vielsagenden Buchstaben A zuerkannt hatte, auf dem Titelblatt als eine *vielverbesserte* hingestellt wird. Kurz findet sich mit dieser Bezeichnung ab, indem er eine ältere rechtmäßige, aber total verschollene Ausgabe annimmt, mit der die Ausgabe A in sprachlicher Hinsicht durchaus übereinstimme. Daß nämlich dieser Ausgabe die sprachliche Priorität zukomme, stützt er eben auf die Ansicht, daß "A eine volkstümlichere Sprache habe als B, was dem ganzen Charakter der Schrift und des Schriftstellers besser entspreche."

Hier setzt der verhängnisvolle Einfluß einer absolut dilettantischen Konstatierung ein, der bis auf unsere Tage nachgewirkt hat. Holland und Kurz zusammen haben der Grimmelshausenforschung eine Richtung gegeben, gegen die Kellers jahrelange, gut fundierende, wissenschaftlich unanfechtbare Arbeit nahezu machtlos war.

Vielleicht liegt das mit daran, daß Keller zu anspruchslos seine Ansicht über die Druckverhältnisse geäußert hat. Er motiviert nämlich seinen Standpunkt mit Bezug auf die Wahl des seiner Ausgabe zugrunde gelegten Textes ziemlich nebenbei in einer der vielen Anmerkungen, mit denen er den ersten Doppelband seiner Ausgabe beschließt. Er hatte eingesehen, wie Ebert bereits im *Bibliographischen Lexikon* hervorgehoben hatte, "daß *A* eine zweite Ausgabe sein müsse." Als die Originalausgabe sah er den anderen Druck aus dem Jahre 1669 an, den er denn auch in einer durchaus zuverlässigen und mit genauem kritischen Apparat versehenen Wiedergabe veröffentlichte. Es war die Ausgabe mit dem Titel: *Der Abentheurliche / Simplicissimus / Teutsch, / Das ist: / Die Beschreibung deß Lebens eines / seltsamen Vaganten, genant Melchior / Sternfels von Fuchshaim, wo und welcher / gestalt Er nemlich in diese Welt kommen, was / er darinn gesehen, gelernet, erfahren und auß- / gestanden, auch warumb er solche wieder / freywillig quittirt. / Überauß lustig, und männiglich / nützlich zu lesen. / An Tag geben / Von / German Schleifheim / von Sulstort. / Monpelgart, / Gedruckt bey Johann Fillion, / Im Jahr M DC LXIX.*

Kellers Bevorzugung der sogenannten Ausgabe *B* war vollständig berechtigt. Das muß ja eigentlich schon daraus hervorgehen, daß er bei der Zusammenstellung seines, alle Ausgaben berücksichtigenden kritischen Apparats keinen Augenblick in seinen Anschauungen irre wurde. Nur schoß er übers Ziel hinaus, wo er in dem Bestreben der Zeit, doch ja den Nachdruck, von dem Grimmelshausen spricht, nachweisen zu können, die Ausgabe *A* nun seinerseits als diesen unberechtigten Nachdruck brandmarkt.

So fand Kögel die Verhältnisse vor, als er zu Anfang der achtziger Jahre eine Textausgabe für die kurz vorher angefangene Serie der Neudrucke veranstaltete. Es ist nicht unmöglich, daß die von Holland fälschlich gewählten, von Keller leider beibehaltenen, von Kurz unwissenschaftlich gestützten Buchstabenbezeichnungen *A* und *B* eine irreführende Suggestion ausgeübt haben. Kögel kam jedenfalls in unbegreiflicher Verkennung von Kellers festbegründeten Schlußfolgerungen auf die alte Ansicht zurück, die in Hollands Buchstabenbezeichnung ihre bedauerliche Namensprägung erhalten hatte. Er kombinierte seine philologisch richtige Bewertung des jeweiligen Sprachstandes der beiden Drucke

mit der falschen, von Kurz übernommenen Hypothese der Prioritäts- und Echtheitsfrage zu einer Anschauung, die Jahrzehnte hindurch die Grimmelshausenforschung beherrscht hat: aus einem absolut verschollenen Druck des Jahres 1668, für den die Bezeichnung *X* passend gefunden wurde, flossen die beiden Drucke von 1669, die sich dadurch unterscheiden, daß *A* als ein sprachlich überarbeiteter, rechtmäßiger Druck anzusehen ist, während wir *B* als einen sich sprachlich eng an das verloren gegangene Original anschließenden Nachdruck betrachten müssen.

Wie ich vor Jahren das Material zu einer sprachlichen Untersuchung der Grimmelshausenschen Schriften sammelte, ergab sich mir, daß in dem Fragenkomplex, der sich auf der Beobachtung der regelmäßigen Druckabweichungen in den sogenannten *A*- und *B*-Ausgaben und der Filiation der Drucke nach der Kögelschen Hypothese aufbaute, etwas nicht stimmte. Immer wieder stieß ich auf Widersprüche, die mich schließlich zu der Einsicht nötigten, daß die Grimmelshausenforschung sich in einem Stadium befand, wo eine Untersuchung, wie ich sie vorhatte, wissenschaftlich noch unmöglich war. Die nächstliegende Aufgabe war daher, eine festere Grundlage zu schaffen und einen kritischen Bericht über die bis dahin gewonnenen Resultate zu geben. So entstanden meine *Probleme der Grimmelshausenforschung* (Groningen 1912).

Über die Frage, die das Thema dieses Aufsatzes bildet, schrieb ich damals: "Mit Bezug auf das wichtigste Werk unseres Dichters wissen wir nicht einmal, was wir für seine Sprache zu halten haben, den Text, wie ihn Keller in seiner Ausgabe vorlegt (*Simplissimus B*) oder den wesentlich anderen Wortlaut, den Kögel seinem Neudruck zugrunde legt (*A*)."¹ Schon damals wies ich die geschraubte Hypothese Kögels zurück und setzte dafür eine einfachere Annahme an die Stelle, die ich vorläufig ohne innere Begründung veröffentlichte. Es war mir nämlich aufgefallen, daß eine unbefangene Vergleichung der Titel der vorliegenden Ausgaben eine mit meinen auf sprachlichem Wege gewonnenen Resultaten übereinstimmende Einsicht in die Druckverhältnisse gibt. Wir finden in jener Zeit die ausgesprochene Neigung, bei jeder folgenden Ausgabe die frühere in der Anwendung prunkhafter Epitheta zu übertrumpfen. Das gilt für die *Erste*, *Zweite*

¹ *Probleme*, Seite 192 Fußnote.

und *Dritte Gesamtausgabe*; das gilt ganz besonders augenfällig für gewisse Einzelschriften in diesen Gesamtausgaben; das gilt, wenn man richtig liest, genau ebenso gut für die verschiedenen Drucke des *Simplicissimus*. Der zweite Druck wird dem ersten gegenüber als *Neueingericht und vielverbessert*, der dritte als *wiederum ganz neu umgegossen und verbessert*, der vierte sogar als *gantz neu eingerichtet, allenthalben viel verbessert* bezeichnet. Dem entsprechend heißt das Buch bald die *Beschreibung*, dann die *vollkommene* und schließlich die *außführliche, unerdichtete, und recht memorable Lebensbeschreibung*, wie auch der Held zunächst nur ein *seltzamer Vagant*, später ein *einfültiger, wunderlicher und seltzamer Vagant* genannt wird. Die durchgeführte Gradation muß jedem in die Augen fallen, der die Titelblätter 1669 B, 1669 A, 1670 C und 1671 D neben einander legt.

Die Ansicht, daß wir abgesehen von vereinzelt Nachdrucks-Exemplaren jedenfalls vier rechtmäßige *Simplicissimus*-drucke besitzen, von denen sich die beiden aus dem Jahre 1669 als *ursprüngliche* und als *überarbeitete* Fassung von einander unterscheiden, suchte ich nach zwei Seiten hin zu befestigen. Die Untersuchung des Bildmaterials der *Simplicianischen* Schriften führte zu einem Aufsatz in der *Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde*, N. F. IV: *J. J. Christoph von Grimmelshausen und die Illustrationen seiner Werke*; eine vorläufige Mitteilung meiner sprachlichen Resultate legte ich in einem Artikel: *Einige sprachliche Erscheinungen in verschiedenen Ausgaben von Grimmelshausens Simplicissimus und Courasche* (PBB 40, Seite 268 flgg.) nieder.

Seitdem hat auch die Kritik Gelegenheit gehabt, zu der damals zuerst veröffentlichten Ansicht Stellung zu nehmen. Die direkten Beurteilungen der *Probleme* haben sich über diesen Punkt, der ja auch nicht zu den Haupttendenzen des Werkes gehört, soviel mir bekannt wurde, nicht geäußert. Um so wichtiger ist die Stellungnahme zweier Grimmelshausenforscher in den beiden bedeutendsten Werken, die seitdem auf diesem Gebiet erschienen sind. Dr. A. Bechtold gibt in seiner aufschlußreichen, feinsinnigen Biographie *Johann Jacob Christoph von Grimmelshausen und seine Zeit*, Heidelberg 1914, seinen Standpunkt zu erkennen, wo er (Seite 151 flgg.) sagt: "Man hat sich lange über die Priorität und Echtheit der verschiedenen Ausgaben, deren Zahl Zeugnis von dem buchhändlerischen Erfolge und der Beliebtheit des Buches ablegt, den

Kopf zerbrochen und ist schließlich zu der Lösung gelangt, eine verschollene Ausgabe *X* des Jahres 1668 anzunehmen und eine der Ausgaben *A* und *B* für einen Nachdruck zu erklären. Ich schließe mich voll und ganz der Ansicht J. H. Scholtes an, daß die Annahme einer uns verloren gegangenen Ausgabe *X* ebenso wie die Behauptung, daß *A* oder *B* ein Nachdruck seien, unbegründet ist und daß man in den Zusammenhang der verschiedenen Drucke die beste Einsicht bekommt, wenn man ihre Titel unbefangen auf sich einwirken läßt." Bechtold läßt dann meine oben zitierte Zusammenstellung der Titel folgen und schließt mit der wichtigen Bemerkung: "Ein Exemplar der unechten Ausgabe, deren Existenz durch die Vorrede der Ausgabe von 1671 festgestellt ist, besitzen wir in dem *Exemplar-Uhland*, das einen Nachdruck von *A* bildet."

Eingehender beschäftigt sich mit der Frage der Druckverhältnisse das Werk, das die Veranlassung zu diesem Aufsatz bildet: *Die beiden ältesten Drucke von Grimmelshausens Simplicissimus sprachlich verglichen von G. Einar Törnvall*, Uppsala 1917. Der Verfasser stellt seine Untersuchung auf die in meinen *Problemen* gegebene Grundlage, indem er, um die Priorität meiner Darstellung zu dokumentieren, "die betreffende Theorie mit meinen Worten anführt (Seite 6, Fußnote)." Seine auf dieser Grundlage aufgebaute sprachliche Untersuchung kommt denn auch im allgemeinen zu denselben Resultaten, wie mein oben zitierter Aufsatz in den *Beiträgen zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* (vgl. Törnvall Seite 246).

Wo sich also die Druckverhältnisse, wie jetzt wohl mit Gewißheit konstatiert werden kann, wesentlich anders verhalten als es Holland, Kurz und Kögel angenommen haben, wo auch die Voraussetzung einer verloren gegangenen Ausgabe *X* sich nicht mehr halten läßt, wäre es jetzt wohl an der Zeit, die irreführenden Bezeichnungen für die verschiedenen Ausgaben definitiv aufzugeben. Ich möchte denn auch an dieser Stelle den Vorschlag machen, die Drucke einfach unter verkürztem Titel neben Angabe der Jahreszahl zu zitieren; die Originalausgabe aus dem Jahre 1669 unter dem Titel *Abentheurlicher Simplicissimus Teutsch*, die von Holland fälschlich als *Ausgabe B* bezeichnet wurde, zitiere ich als *Simplicissimus 1669 (SS 1669)*; die sprachlich überarbeitete Ausgabe aus demselben Jahre, die Holland *A* nannte, bezeichne ich als

überarbeiteten *Simplicissimus* 1669 (üSS 1669), während für die bisher unter den Buchstaben *C* und *D* bekannten Drucke die Bezeichnung *SS* 1670 und *SS* 1671 genügt. Die vereinzelt von diesen vier wichtigsten Drucken abweichenden Exemplare, die teils auf Nachdruck, teils auf Vermischung von Druckbogen zurückzuführen sind, werden soweit die Forschung Veranlassung hat, sich mit ihnen zu beschäftigen, am besten nach dem Aufbewahrungsort bezeichnet.

Die neue Ansicht über die Druckverhältnisse der verschiedenen *Simplicissimus*-Ausgaben, die durch den Beitritt Bechtolds und die meine Ansicht bestätigenden Untersuchungen Törnvals jetzt als gesichert betrachtet werden darf, hat das Problem der sprachlichen Abweichungen in ein ganz neues Stadium gebracht: in verschiedenen, sämtlich rechtmäßigen Drucken desselben Werkes wird die Sprache in markant verschiedener Weise gehandhabt, so daß sich mit Bezug auf etymologische, syntaktische und stilistische Eigentümlichkeiten durchgehende und ungemein belehrende Unterschiede verzeichnen lassen.

Eine Bereicherung erhält dieses Material durch den Umstand, daß auch von der *Simplicianischen* Schrift, die sich am nächsten an den *Simplicissimus* anschließt: *Trutz-Simplex oder Ausführliche und wunderseltzame Lebensbeschreibung Der Ertzbetrügerin und Landstörtzerin Courasche*, 1670, eine überarbeitete Ausgabe besteht, über die ich *PBB* 40, Seite 276 flgg. berichtete. Sie kennzeichnet sich auf den ersten Blick durch die Namensschreibung der Heldin auf dem Titelblatt, die hier in überarbeiteter Form *Courage* genannt wird. Wie also dem *Simplicissimus* 1669 (*SS* 1669) der überarbeitete *Simplicissimus* 1669 (üSS 1669) gegenübersteht, so verhält sich zur ursprünglichen *Courasche* 1670 (*C* 1670) die überarbeitete *Courage* 1670 (*Cg* 1670). Es ist keineswegs undenkbar, daß fortgesetzte Untersuchungen noch weitere Überarbeitungen *Simplicianischer* Schriften zu Tage fördern werden; zunächst wäre eine solche Ausgabe vom Gegenstück der *Courasche*, dem *Seltzamen Springinsfeld*, zu erwarten. Was wir, abgesehen vom üSS 1669, den darauf zurückgehenden späteren Drucken und *Cg* 1670, an *Simplicianischen* und anderen *Grimmelshausenschen* Schriften besitzen, gehört in die Reihe der nicht-überarbeiteten Ausgaben, steht auf dem Sprachstand des *SS* 1669, resp. der *C* 1670 und repräsentiert also *Grimmelshausens* ursprüngliche,

eigene Sprache. Die Überarbeitung aber stammt wohl nicht von dem Dichter selbst, sondern wurde von dem Verleger, Felsäcker in Nürnberg, veranlaßt und von einem Korrektor ausgeführt. Das ist das Resultat, zu dem mich die systematische Untersuchung dieser Frage geführt hat: "Aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach war es Wolff Eberhard Felsäcker in Nürnberg, der die sprachliche Überarbeitung veranlaßte. Der Korrektor muß in sprachlichen Sachen kein Fremdling gewesen sein; seine Handhabung gewisser Regeln für die Stellung des finiten Verbs im Nebensatz weist auf detailliertere sprachtheoretische Kenntnisse hin, als die uns aus dem Siebzehnten Jahrhundert überlieferten Grammatiken, soweit sie mir bekannt sind, sie zu geben vermochten. Seine Heimat haben wir vielleicht in dem damals sprachgewaltigen Nürnberg, dem Wohnort Felsäckers, zu suchen. (PBB 40, Seite 303.)" Törnvall tritt in dem Gesamtergebnis seiner Untersuchung dieser Ansicht bei: "Versuchen wir, auf Grund des oben Gesagten die Frage zu beantworten, ob diese tiefgreifenden Veränderungen eine Entwicklung der Sprache unseres Verfassers bedeuten, so scheint aus der Übereinstimmung von *B* mit den späteren Werken deutlich hervorzugehen, daß die Auflage *A* (zusammen mit der späteren Fassung der *Courasche*, vgl. Scholte a.a.O.) ihre Sprachform nicht dem Verfasser selbst verdanken kann. Natürlich haben wir keine Garantie dafür, daß *B* und die späteren Schriften Grimmelshausens Sprache unverfälscht wiedergeben, aber alle Wahrscheinlichkeit spricht dafür, daß im allgemeinen die volkstümliche Version ein treueres Bild seiner Sprache gibt als die Überarbeitung." (Vgl. außer Seite 245 auch Seite 25.)

Wie einschneidend die Resultate dieser Neuorientierung auch auf rein sprachlichem Gebiet sein müssen, dafür gibt Törnvall ein belehrendes Bild anläßlich seiner Behandlung des Rückumlauts. Es ist neuerdings gebräuchlich geworden, die rückumlautenden Formen im *Simplicissimus* auf Grimmelshausens hessische Herkunft zurückzuführen.³ Es ist kein Wunder, daß diese Formen die Aufmerksamkeit der Grammatiker erregt haben; es muß jedem Leser auffallen, wenn wir z.B. das Zeitwort *setzen* ziemlich ausnahmslos mit rückumlautendem Praeteritum antreffen: *satzte*

³ So Agnes von Sobbe: *Die Ausgleichung des Rückumlautes*, Heidelberg, 1911, und John Stärk: *Studien zur Geschichte des Rückumlautes*, Uppsala 1912.

(Kögel 58, 11; 59, 19; 82, 39; 87, 17; 107, 29; 187, 1; 353, 10; 16, 39; 71, 10; 381, 22), *besatzte* (220, 9), *entsatzte* (19, 29), *ersatzte* (83, 7), *hinsatzte* (512, 2), *fürsatzte* (286, 25), *versatzte* (71, 22), *vorsatzte* (73, 13). Wenn wir nun aber diese Stellen, die ich an der Hand von R. Müller: *Die Sprache in Grimmelshausens Simplicissimus*, Eisenberg 1897, zitiere, im SS 1669 nachschlagen, so zeigt es sich, daß ohne jede Ausnahme diese rückumlautenden Formen auf nachträglicher Korrektur beruhen: Grimmelshausen selbst schrieb *setzte*, resp. mit der für ihn so bezeichnenden Apokope *setzt*, *besetzt(e)*, *entsetzt(e)*, *ersetzt(e)*, *hinsetzt(e)*, *fürsetzt(e)*, *versetzt(e)*, *vorsetzt(e)*, und die rückumlautenden Formen sind dem Nürnberger Korrektor zuzuschreiben. So bleibt von dem Hinweis auf Grimmelshausens Heimat nichts übrig und muß die ganze Konstatierung umgewendet werden. Es ist überhaupt in Zukunft nicht mehr zulässig, die überarbeitete *Simplicissimus*-Ausgabe, wie es in Wörterbüchern und sprachlichen Untersuchungen so oft geschieht, als Zeugnis für Grimmelshausens Sprache anzuführen. Ich möchte daher der dahinzielenden Schlussbemerkung Törnqvalls, "daß es methodisch nicht gerechtfertigt sei, die Ausgabe 1669 A als für die Sprache und die literarische Stellung des Verfassers charakteristisch anzuführen," eine möglichst allgemeine Verbreitung wünschen. Wer künftighin den *Simplicissimus* zitiert, benutze für sprachliche Zwecke ausschließlich die Ausgabe Kellers, den nicht-überarbeiteten Text aus dem Jahre 1669.

[Schluss folgt.]

J. H. SCHOLTE.

Amsterdam.

TWO LETTERS WRITTEN BY RACINE TO HIS SISTER

In January, 1918, I called attention¹ to four of Racine's letters privately owned in England and mentioned by the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts.² Three months later these letters were sold at Sotheby's by the widow of Alfred Morrison. The catalogue that announced the sale reproduced the text of the letters, wholly or in part, thus adding materially to the scant information furnished by the Royal Commission. It now appears

¹ *M. L. N.*, vol. XXXIII, pp. 30-33.

² *Ninth Report*, Part II, p. 462, London, 1883.

that of these four letters the one³ that was written "au Camp deuant Mons" is dated April 3rd, 1691, not April 30th as stated in the *Report*. The text given in Sotheby's catalogue shows that it is the same as that of a letter preserved, according to Mesnard, at the Bibliothèque Nationale and published by him in the *Grands Écrivains* edition of Racine.⁴ Its identification from the *Report* was impossible, as the text was not given there and the date was incorrectly stated. This letter was sold to Maggs Brothers for £54. The letter⁵ written at Le Quesnoy, May 16, 1692, reproduced in the *Report* and in my article, was sold to Agnew and Sons for £44. The two remaining letters, addressed by Racine to his sister, were purchased for £36 each by a Parisian dealer in autographs, Charavay, and were in turn sold by him to an inhabitant of Toulouse. Learning last July the name of the purchaser, I wrote to him for further information about the letters, but have received no reply. As he has given no evidence of an intention to publish the two letters, I have decided to reproduce them here in the incomplete form in which they appear in Sotheby's catalogue.

"976. 13¼ pp. 8^{vo}, 'A Versailles, ce 22 Fevrier' (1685?) to his sister, Marie Racine:

" 'Je suis inconsolable, ma chère sœur, de ce que viens [*sic*] de voir chez Monsieur le Contrôleur Général. J'ay vu que Monsieur Rivière estoit supprimé. Je n'ay appris qu'aujourd'hui que ces choses-là ne se régloient pas chez Monsieur comme Monsieur de Boisfranc me l'avoit dit. Cela a esté cause que je n'ay pas fait un pas pour vous. Vous auriez bien dû me mander que tous vos gens faisoient des diligences auprès de Monsieur l'Intendant. Moy, qui suis accablé d'affaires, je n'ay pas seulement soupçonné que cela dust est [*sic*] réglé chez Monsieur le Contrôleur Général, où je n'avois qu'un mot à dire' etc.

"977. 2 pp. 4^{to}, 'A Paris, ce jour des cendres' (1685), to the same:

" 'Je vous prie, ma chère sœur, de faire bien mes excuses à mon Oncle Racine et à Monsieur Regnaud de ce que je ne leur écris point. Je suis si accablé d'affaires que je ne sçay où me tourner. Dites-leur bien que je les remercie de tout mon cœur de la part

³ Numbered by Sotheby, 978.

⁴ Vol. vii, p. 15.

⁵ Numbered by Sotheby 979.

qu'ils ont prise à vostre affaire. Assurez mon Oncle que j'en conserveray la mémoire toute ma vie. Comme en effet on ne peut m'escire là-dessus plus obligeamment qu'il a [sic] fait. [sic] Je me suis ravisé en vous escrivant, et j'ay résolu d'escire à Monsieur Regnaud deux ou trois lignes de remerciement.'"

By comparing these letters with others, published by Mesnard, I have been able to determine the fact that the affair in question is undoubtedly the loss by Racine's brother-in-law, Rivière, of his position in the salt-office of La Ferté-Milon.⁶ As the French financial administration was then organized, the nation's supply of salt was placed in 154 *greniers*, and distributed from each of these to retail merchants by a board consisting of a *président*, a *contrôleur*, a *grenetier*, a *procureur du roi*, and a *receveur*. After 1663 the distribution was made under the supervision of the intendant for the district. In questions of reinstatement final authority rested with the king and his representative, the *contrôleur général*, but the intendant of the district had the power to recommend action with regard to a local official. Before these letters were written Rivière held the positions of *grenetier* and *contrôleur alternatif* in Racine's native town, La Ferté-Milon.⁷ Claude Racine and François Regnaud, mentioned in the second letter, were, respectively, *contrôleur* and *procureur du roi* at the same place.⁸ After Colbert's death in 1683 the *contrôleur général* was Le Pelletier. The intendant for the district of Soissons, in which lay La Ferté-Milon, was from 1682 to 1685 Roland Le Vayer, sieur de Boutigny.⁹

The year in which these letters were written may be determined by comparing them with another letter written by Racine to his sister, dated Feb. 27 and published by Mesnard.¹⁰ Racine there speaks in detail of the effort he has been making to reinstate

⁶ Charles Godard, *les Pouvoirs des intendants sous Louis XIV*, Paris, Librairie de la société du recueil général des lois & des arrêts, 1901, pp. 266, 273.

⁷ Mesnard, *op. cit.*, vol. VI, p. 529.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 528, 529.

⁹ Godard, *op. cit.*, p. 539. A certain community of taste between him and Racine might be established, if he can be proved to have been related to François Le Voyer sieur de Boutigny, who was not only *maître des requêtes*, but author of a tragedy published in 1643, *le grand Selim ou le Couronnement tragique*. Cf. *la Bibliothèque du théâtre françois*, Dresden, 1768, vol. III, p. 20.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, vol. VI, pp. 527-529.

Rivière, refers to Regnaud and his uncle Racine, reports the receipt that same morning of a letter from the intendant regretting that he had not learned sooner of the relationship existing between Racine and Rivière. This letter must have been written about the same time as were the two I am publishing,¹¹ after the first, which was written when Racine had just learned of his brother-in-law's removal, and before the second, in which the affair seems almost ended and the poet has reached the point of thanking Regnaud and his uncle for their services. Now Mesnard shows that this letter could not have been written earlier than 1678, as Racine was established at court only in 1677, nor later than 1686, since mention is made in it of Antoine Vitart, who died in 1687 and was already seriously ill in January of that year. Of the nine years remaining he selects 1685 because Racine speaks of having to wait till his mourning garments are ready before he can visit the *contrôleur général*. This would seem to refer to court mourning, the only example of which mentioned in the *Gazette* during those nine years is the mourning worn for Charles II from February to May, 1685.

Support of this conclusion can be found by appealing to the calendar. The three letters are dated Feb. 22nd, Feb. 27th, and Ash Wednesday. As I have just shown that the third of these letters was written last, they must have been composed in a year in which Ash Wednesday came after Feb. 27. But from 1678 to 1686 this happened only in the years 1680, 1683, and 1685, when Ash Wednesday fell on March 6th, 3rd, and 7th, respectively.¹² Hence 1685 may not only be allowed to stand, but it is one of only three possible years in which the letters could have been written.

Further evidence lies in the fact that at the end of 1684 there was a general reduction of officials in the salt office and that by an edict of January, 1685, their positions were handed over to local

¹¹ As Rivière lost his place again in 1697, the question might be asked whether the two letters refer to that occasion, but the second letter cannot, for it mentions Regnaud, who died in 1694 (cf. Mesnard, *op. cit.*, vol. VI, p. 519). It is also unlikely that the first refers to it, for a letter of May 24, 1697 (*ibid.*, vol. VII, pp. 172-174), speaks of the affair as if it had recently occurred, so that a letter dated Feb. 22 could hardly be concerned with it.

¹² Cf. F. K. Ginzel, *Handbuch der Mathematischen und Technischen Chronologie*, Leipzig, 1914, vol. III, p. 417.

collectors, known as *élus*.¹³ It is probable that Rivière lost his position as a result of this reduction in the number of officials. The letters published show the part Racine played in the effort to restore him to his post.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

Johns Hopkins University.

LAWRENCE MINOT

In regard to the author of the political poems contained in MS. Cotton Galba E ix, we have no other information than that which is afforded by the poems themselves. We know that his name was Lawrence Minot,¹ and that his poetical activity is connected with events between 1333 and 1352.² The surname Minot is not a common one, and of the six or seven fourteenth century Minots of whom Hall found traces in the public records,³ none bears the name of Lawrence. That the Lawrence Minot who is named in the documents printed below was the author of the poems in MS. Cotton Galba E ix, is probably impossible either to prove or disprove. But inasmuch as these documents constitute (to the best of my knowledge) the only record that has been found of a Lawrence Minot who was contemporary with the author of the poems, it seems worth while to make them known. They belong to the year 1331 and con-

¹³ Godard, *op. cit.*, p. 275. That they were not all so treated is shown by letters of Le Vayer of February 18 and March 7, 1685, in which he refers to the "réunion d'une partie des greniers à sel aux élections." Cf. de Boislisle, *Correspondance des Contrôleurs généraux*, Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1874, vol. I, p. 43.

¹ The lines in which the poet gives his name are:

Minot with mowth had menid to make (v, 1)

and

Now Laurence Minot will bigin (vii, 20)

² See Hall, *Poems of Laurence Minot* (Oxford, third edition, 1914), p. xii and his notes to the various poems. The second poem deals with the battle of Bannockburn (1314), but it appears to have been written after the first, which deals with the battle of Halidon Hill (1333); see Hall's notes.

³ Hall, pp. x ff.

cern the purchase by Lawrence Minot in 1320 of a piece (or pieces)⁴ of land in Cressy Forest, and the remission by Edward III in 1331 of a part of the purchase money still due.⁵ The documents are as follows:

Patent Roll 176 (5 Edward III, Part 2), membrane 8.

Pro Iohanne Lenfaunt.⁶

Rex omnibus ad quos, *etc.*, salutem. Supplicavit nobis Iohannes Lenfaunt, per petitionem suam coram nobis et concilio nostro exhibitam, ut cum ipse, tempore quo Comitatus Pontiuui fuit in manibus Isabelle Regine Anglie matris nostre, anno videlicet domini millesimo trecentesimo vicesimo nono, emisset in foresta nostra de Cressy duodecim iorneas bosci et dimidiam pro quadam pecunie summa monete debilis in regno Francie tunc currentis ad diversos dies infra quam terminum, videlicet primo die Decembris proxime preterito dicta mater nostra comitatum predictum reddidit in manus nostras, quo die ducentas quinquaginta et octo libras pro tribus terminis tunc futuris nobis ratione reddicionis illius de

⁴ Whether, in spite of discrepancies, both the Latin and the French documents printed below refer to the same transaction, I am unable to determine.

⁵ An abstract of the first of these documents is contained in the *Calendar of the Patent Rolls*, 1330-1334, p. 187, dated Oct. 15, 1331. This abstract is as follows:

Grant to John Lenfaunt; on his petition for remission of part of the purchase money for twelve and a half journeys (*jorneas*) of wood in Cressy Forest bought by him in 1329, when the county of Ponthieu was in the hands of queen Isabella for a sum to be paid by instalments in the coinage then current in France, whereof a balance of 258 pounds was still due at the time of the surrender of the county to the king by the said queen, on the ground that since the time of the purchase the coinage had become so depreciated as to be worth scarce half what it then was; that he shall be quit of the balance on payment of 129 pounds of Paris of the present currency.

By pet. of C.

Mandate in pursuance to the receiver of the county of Ponthieu.

The like grant to Laurence Mynotz under precisely similar circumstances.

By pet. of C.

In printing the Latin and French documents I have supplied punctuation and regulated the use of capitals. The italics used for clearness in the Latin documents are mine.

⁶ On October 5, 1312, John Lenfant, knight, was appointed seneschal of Ponthieu and Monstreuil (*Calendar of the Patent Rolls*, 1307-1313, p. 501). For orders addressed to John Lenfaunt as seneschal of Ponthieu on May 20, 1313, and July 28, 1315, see *Calendar of the Close Rolls*, 1307-1313, p. 582, and 1313-1318, p. 301.

summa illa soluere teneretur, velimus ei in solucione dictarum ducentarum quinquaginta et octo librarum partem pecunie illius remittere generose, presertim cum moneta predicta infra terminum predictum in tantum sit deteriorata quod ad valorem medietatis monete nunc currentis in dicto regno Francie vix attingit. Nos, consideracionem condignam ad hoc habentes ac volentes prefato Iohanni gratiam in hac parte facere specialem, concessimus ei quod ipse pro predictis ducentis quinquaginta et octo libris quas nobis pro dictis tribus terminis ex causa predicta soluere teneretur soluat nobis centum et viginti et nouem libras Paris' in dicto regno Francie nunc currentes et quod de residuo earundem ducentarum quinquaginta et octo librarum extunc erga nos exoneratus sit penitus et quietus. In cuius, *etc.* Teste Rege apud Westmonasterium .xv. die Octobris. Per petitionem de consilio.

Et mandatum est Receptori Regis Comitatus Pontiui qui nunc est vel pro tempore fuerit quod, receptis a prefato Iohanne predictis, centum et viginti et nouem libris Paris', ipsum de predictis ducentis quinquaginta et octo libris exonerari et quietum esse faciat, iuxta tenorem litterarum Regis predictarum. Teste, *ut supra*.

Pro Laurencio Mynotz.

Rex omnibus ad quos, *etc.*, salutem. Supplicauit nobis Laurencius Mynotz per petitionem, *etc.*, *ut supra usque ibi* vicesimo nono, emisset in foresta nostra de Cressy duodecim iorneas bosci et dimidiam, *etc.*, *ut supra usque ibi* in manus nostras, *et tunc sit* quo die ducentas quinquaginta et octo libras pro tribus terminis tunc futuris nobis ratione reddicionis illius de summa illa soluere teneretur, velimus, *etc.*, *ut supra*. Teste, *ut supra*.

Per petitionem consilio.

Et mandatum est Receptori predicto quod, receptis a prefato Laurencio predictis centum et viginti et nouem libris Paris', ipsum de eisdem ducentis quinquaginta et octo libris exonerari et quietum esse faciat, iuxta tenorem litterarum Regis predictarum. Teste, *ut supra*.

Exchequer Accounts, 166, No. 2.

Account book of the Receiver of Ponthieu, 5 Edward III, 23 February, 1330/1, to Michaelmas, 1331.

Receptes faites de ventes de bois et forestes du Seigneur et premierement de la Forest de Crescy.

De Loreng de Minguot, li quex achata lan xxix. en Feurier xij. iourn' LXXV. verges de bois de mesme la forest appelle le Flos de Solaill pur xviij. li. xvij. s. Paris le iournal, des quex furent rebats v. verges pur places wydes et bois eslaquie. Ainssi demurent de bois plain xij. iourn' et LXX. vergez, qui montent en somme au pris dessus dit a ij. c. xxxix. li. xvij. s. x. d. Paris, dez quex sont rebats pur trencage, *etc.*, contre le marcheant iiij. li. xij. s. x. d.

Paris. Ainssi demurent du frank' au seigneur cc. xxxiiij. li. xv. s. Paris, a paier en ij. ans a iiij. termes, chascun an cxvij. li. vii. s. vj. d. Paris' a ij. termes, nostre dame en Septembre⁷ et Bohourdich,⁸ a chascun terme Lvij. li. xij. s. ix. d. Paris, le primer terme de paiement comensant a le nostre dame en Septembre lan xxx. pur son paiement de Bohordich et nostre dame en Septembre, eschenz en ceste accompte, et est uncore j. terme de paiement a venir, c. xvij. li. vij. s. vj. d. Paris, lez quex li sont quitie de la grace du Roi den-gleterre nosseigneur tant du temps de ceste accompte pour paier mailles pur Paris, dont li receueur ce charge Lvij. li. xij. s. ix. d.

SAMUEL MOORE.

University of Michigan.

ON THE ORIGIN OF PROBATIONARY ODES FOR THE LAUREATSHIP.

If the reader whose mental palate is pleased by the sharp taste of parody thinks back through the nineteenth century to the *Rejected Addresses* of the brothers Smith, and beyond their happy verses to the Anti-Jacobin's political parodies, and a dozen years beyond those earlier masterpieces, he remembers the pungent savor of *Probationary Odes for the Laureatship*. This series of burlesque poems, produced by the scribbling followers and friends of Charles Fox, soon after their triumphant publication of *Criticisms on the Rolliad*, is sufficiently important in the history of English satire to justify some interest in the subject of its origins.

Obviously William Whitehead was in a certain sense an indispensable link in the chain of circumstances which brought about the appearance of the jovial parodies in question. For Whitehead was Poet-Laureat, and had he not died in 1785 the mock odes in competition for his vacant place certainly would not have been written in that year and might never have been written at all. In quite another way also he was unwittingly responsible for the inception of the clever notion which grew into the "probationary" poems of the wits of Brooks's. Although it has been customary to find a source for the *Odes* in Isaac Browne's *The Pipe of Tobacco*

⁷ September 8, the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin.

⁸ "Nom donné au premier et au second dimanche de carême" (Godefroy, *Dictionnaire de l'Ancienne Langue Française*, I, 613, s. v. *behordeis*, of which *bohourdis*, *bouhourdich*, etc., are variant forms).

(1736),¹ the idea from which they were developed is traceable to a satire which owed its origin to a poem of Whitehead's own. Whatever may have been their remote inheritance from the satires in the "Parnassian" tradition or from the parodies of Pope or of Browne, the *Probationary Odes* are descended in a direct but illegitimate line from the aged laureat's long-winded fable entitled *The Goat's Beard* (1777).

The least insignificant fact about this rambling inflation of eight lines of Phaedrus is that it provoked a reply called *The Asses Ears* (1777), an anonymous poem in a very thin pamphlet. In this ephemeral satire appears the basic idea of the *Probationary Odes*. The fable is to this effect: Jove assembled all the animals and announced his intention of naming one of their number Poet-Laureat and decorating him with the spacious ears

Which erst to Midas were assign'd,
To mark the monarch's critic mind.

The Monkey, the Fox, the Dog, and the Bear presented themselves in turn, each arguing for his own candidacy. Doctor Johnson as the Bear almost won the coveted prize. This was his sentence:

'Tho' for your voyage the envied meed,
Might to your brows have been decreed,
And well your tracts of politics,
Might on your head the trophy fix,
Yet as some things which once you writ,
Are stigmatiz'd with sense and wit,
We deem you for the place unfit.'

The next aspirant, the Ass, presented his case in part as follows:

'Have I, on any one pretence,
Been known to deviate into sense?
Who then is versed like me to cheer,
With tranquil sounds Jove's quiet ear,

¹ See Fuess, *Lord Byron as a Satirist in Verse* (New York, 1912), 28. With almost as good reason the source-hunter might go back two years beyond the *Pipe of Tobacco* to a collection of poems which were actually written in competition for a prize, *The Contest: being Poetical Essays on the Queen's Grotto, wrote in consequence of an invitation in the Gentleman's Magazine for April, 1733, wherein was Proposed, that the Author of the Best Piece be entitled to a volume for that year, Royal Paper, and finely bound in Morocco; and the Author of the second Best, to a volume Common Paper* (London, 1734).

And lull to rest the high abodes,
With *New-year songs* and *Birth-day Odes*?''

He was elected by acclamation.

There we have quite conventional satire in the arguments of beastly bards concerning their rights to claim first place among the poets. In *The Wreath of Fashion* (1778), Richard Tickell suggested a more artistic treatment of much the same theme. The subject of a competition among poets for a laureatship is by no means so original that the appearance of two adaptations of it in the same city in successive years proves that the second is derived from the first. Attendant circumstances, however, particularly the fact that both are directly concerned with Whitehead's fable of *The Goat's Beard*, make it seem likely that Tickell either took a hint for *The Wreath* from *The Asses Ears* or else himself wrote both pieces. The immediate suggestion for Tickell's new treatment of the old material came from Lord Clare's *Verses addressed to the Queen with a New Year's Gift of Irish Poplin* (1775).² The satirist explains in a note that "the recollection of the Poplin leads to a digression, in the Pindaric stile of all Laureats." The speaker is Whitehead, and this is his digression:

'What, if some rival Bard my empire share!
Yet, yet, I tremble at the name of Clare.
Pindar to Clare had yielded—so did I—
Alas, can Poetry with Poplin vie!
Ah me! if Poets barter for applause,
How Jerningham will thrive on flimsy gauze!
What tatter'd tinsel Luttrell will display!
Carmarthen, sattin—Carlisle, paduasoy!
Garriek will follow his old remnant trade;
He'll buy my place with Jubilee-brocade.
While Anstey, the reversion to obtain,
Vamps his Bath drugget, till he spoils the grain.
Perish the thought! hence visionary fear!
Phoebus, or Phaedrus, shall old Whitehead cheer.
Behold their nobler gift: be this preferr'd!
He said; and proudly brandish'd the *Goat's beard*.⁴

² *The Asses Ears, a Fable. Addressed to the Author of The Goat's Beard* (London, 1777), 5, 8, 10.

³ This piece was the object of a parody entitled: *Verses addressed to the — with a New Year's Gift of Irish Potatoes by Lord Knows Who. In Imitation of a Late Poem* (London, 1775).

⁴ *The School for Satire: or, A Collection of Modern Satirical Poems writ-*

From these lines it is evident that Tickell took up the idea of a competition of poets for the laureatship and extended his treatment of it to include a suggestion that the poets should not only plead their own causes but should bring gifts and specimens of their composition as well. Therein lies the originality of the *Probationary Odes*, that they are in pretence samples offered by various ambitious bards as representative of the verses they could write for the King. The fact that Tickell had the idea seven years before it was employed in the series of parodies does not prove that he was responsible for its application in that series. But such a connection is made to seem probable by the details of his connection with the Whig pamphleteers of the Rolliad group. In 1778 he made his name by publishing *Anticipation*, a clever prose satire against the ministry. Soon he turned to supporting the party in power, but he returned to the side of Fox and the Whigs within a year or two, apparently by the persuasions of his brother-in-law, Richard Brinsley Sheridan. Tickell was, so far as records show, only a minor contributor to the *Criticisms on the Rolliad*, surely not a leading spirit in the work. On the other hand, it is certain that he took an important part in the production of the *Probationary Odes for the Laureatship*, writing much of the introductory matter in prose and all of two odes and having a hand in the manufacture of at least one other.⁵ Indicative that he had done literary work of importance to the Whigs is the fact that in 1785 he achieved the goal of his ambition, election to membership in the distinguished club which met at Brooks's.⁶ On the whole, it seems more than likely that Richard Tickell was the prime mover in the conception of the *Probationary Odes*, that he nursed the idea for several years, and that he actually derived the inspiration for it from the laureat poet William Whitehead.

R. C. WHITFORD.

Knox College.

ten during the present reign (London, 1801), 153-154. *The Wreath of Fashion* occupies pp. 143-159.

⁵ For information concerning Tickell's share in the authorship of the various papers in the Rolliad series, see *Notes and Queries* II, 114, 373; III, 129-131. Cf. also Moore's *Life of Sheridan*, I, 420 ff.

⁶ W. Fraser Rae, *Sheridan*, I, 357. Cf. Walter Sichel, *Sheridan*, I, 442 ff.

WILLIAM LICHFIELD AND HIS COMPLAINT OF GOD

Mr. E. Borgström, in *Anglia*, xxxiv, 508 ff., prints *The Complaint of God to Sinful Man, and the Answer of Man*, by William Lichfield, from MS. Gonville and Caius Coll. 174. This, he says, is the first time the poem has been printed; in this statement, however, he is mistaken, for it is the same poem, with some omissions, transpositions, and variant readings in single lines, as that printed by Dr. Furnivall in *Political, Religious, and Love Poems* (E. E. T. S., revised edition, 1903), pp. 198 ff., from MSS. Lambeth 306 and 853, under the titles *The Complaynt of Criste* and *Christ's Own Complaint*, respectively. The chief variations between the version in *Anglia* and that from MS. Lambeth 853—which is a better text than the one in MS. 306—are given below:

The following lines in *Lam.* are not in *Ang.*: 453-85; 493-501; 509-17; 589-97; 613-21; 637-45; 749-67—a total of ninety lines.

The following lines are in different order: *Lam.* 485-93 = *Ang.* 521-9; *Lam.* 501-9 = *Ang.* 513-21; *Lam.* 645-61 = *Ang.* 401-17; *Lam.* 661-77 = *Ang.* 465-81; *Lam.* 677-85 = *Ang.* 529-37.

Besides these, there are frequent variations in phraseology, and in some stanzas a substitution of an entire line or two.

In MS. Lambeth 306 a short poem has been prefixed to this *Complaint*, and written as part of it; they are in reality separate works.¹ The same short poem is also in MS. Lambeth 853, but is not connected with the longer *Complaint*: the former ends on fol. 88, and the latter begins on fol. 193. Dr. Furnivall, however, prints the two with a continuous numbering of the lines as if they were one poem. The poem in which we are interested—the one by Lichfield—begins with l. 133, on p. 199 (from MS. 853), and l. 137, p. 198 (from MS. 306). (All references are to the revised edition of 1903.)

According to the *Dictionary of National Biography* there are two poems by Lichfield in Gonville and Caius College MS. 174, entitled respectively *The Complaynt of God to Sinful Man and the Answer of Man*, and *A Dialogue of the Passion between God and the Penitent Soul*. Mr. Borgström corrects this statement: this

¹ See the E. E. T. S. edition, pp. 198 and xix.

second poem is a part of the *Complaint* which was left out at the proper place and then written in at the end with an indication of the place where it belonged.²

Neither Dr. Furnivall nor Mr. Borgström has noted that this *Complaint* is also found in MS. Camb. Ff. II, 38, from which an extract is printed in *Percy Society Publications*, XIV, 87. As this extract corresponds closely to Christ's tenth complaint and Man's tenth answer in MS. Lambeth 853 (ll. 645-709), it is probable that the versions in these two manuscripts are practically the same.

Warton is authority for the statement that there was a copy of the *Complaint* in a folio manuscript in the possession of Henry Huth.³

"Complaints" of Christ were a popular theme in medieval literature.⁴ Some, like Lichfield's poem, were in the form of a dialogue between God or Christ, and Man; others were monologues. For examples of the dialogue form see *Cursor Mundi*, ll. 17, 111 ff.; poems of Jakob Ryman, in Herrig's *Archiv*, LXXXIX, 264; and a poem from the Fairfax Manuscript, *ibid.* CVI, 63. A *Dialogus inter Deum et Peccatorem* is among the works of Innocent III, but this seems not to have influenced the "Complaints": it is too scholastic in tone to be suitable for poetic purposes.⁵

The information hitherto gathered concerning the life of Lichfield, as given in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, may be briefly stated:

He was a doctor of divinity—of Oxford, according to Wood and Pits; of Cambridge, according to Gascoigne. He was rector of the church of All Hallows the Great, Thames Street, London; and was one of the most famous preachers of his time. In addition to the *Complaint*, he left "no fewer than 3083 sermons written in English with his own hand," besides a collection of materials for sermons, entitled *Mille Exempla*. He died October 24, 1448, and was buried under the communion table of his church.

The above-mentioned conflicting claims for Oxford and Cambridge as Lichfield's university seem to be due to a confusion of this William Lichfield with a younger man of the same name, who

² *Anglia*, XXXIV, 498.

³ T. Warton, *History of English Poetry*, III, 95.

⁴ See the article by Professor Cook in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, VII, 268; and a note in his edition of Cynewulf's *Christ*, p. 207.

⁵ Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, CCXVII, 691.

was probably a graduate of Oxford, was pastor of All Hallows in the Wall, London (not All Hallows the Great), and later Chancellor of St. Paul's, and who died about 1517.⁶ Gascoigne, who was Chancellor of the University of Oxford and a contemporary of Lichfield, was undoubtedly correct in assigning the latter to Cambridge.

I have found a few items which give a more complete idea of Lichfield's interests and activities. The *Dictionary of National Biography* says that the date of his appointment as rector of All Hallows the Great is unknown; Hennessy gives the date as 1425, without, however, citing any authority.⁷

According to Hennessy, again, Lichfield was rector of St. Mary Magdalene, Old Fish Street, London, as well as of All Hallows the Great.⁸ Here also he gives no authority. The *Victoria History of London* accepts Hennessy's statement.⁹ If this is true Lichfield was a pluralist, and thus a participator in a practice which was a source of constant trouble and frequent complaints in the fifteenth century. Such an attitude is contrary to what we should expect from Lichfield's position on other church matters. Moreover, an entry in the *Patent Rolls* for April 24, 1448, names John Carpenter as the rector of St. Mary Magdalene.¹⁰ In Hennessy's list of rectors John Carpenter's term is given as from 1415 to 1441. Then follows Lichfield, from 1441 to 1448. It would seem, then, that Hennessy is wrong in including Lichfield among the rectors of this church.

In 1446 Sir John Fray, chief baron of the exchequer, William Lichfield, and Gilbert Worthington, clerks, were selected as arbiters in a dispute over a rectory between Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and the prior and convent of Barnwell.¹¹

Lichfield is named in a list of benefactors of Queen's College, Cambridge.¹²

⁶ Wood, *Fasti Oxonienses*, I, 7; and G. Hennessy, *Novum Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense*, pp. xxiii and 82.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 83.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. lix and 31.

⁹ *Victoria History of the Counties of England—London*, I, 228.

¹⁰ *Cal. Pat. Rolls (1446-1452)*, p. 151.

¹¹ W. G. Searle, *The History of the Queen's College of St. Margaret and St. Bernard*, Cambridge Antiquarian Society, 1867 (Octavo Publications, v, 67).

¹² *Op. cit.*, p. 33.

On August 26, 1446, William Bingham, William Lichfield, William Millington, Gilbert Worthington, John Cote, and others, professors in sacred theology, were granted a license to found a new college, to be known as Godeshous (later called Christ's College), at Cambridge.¹³

On October 12, 1446, John Somerset, chancellor of the exchequer, William Lichfield, Reginald Pecock, and others were granted a license to found a gild in honor of the nine orders of holy angels, at New Braynford, Middlesex.¹⁴

In 1447, William Lichfield, Gilbert Worthington, John Cote, and John Neel, clergymen of London, petitioned Parliament that they be given permission to establish grammar schools in their respective parishes.¹⁵ New schools in charge of competent instructors were sorely needed, for the existing institutions were overcrowded and the teachers were often illiterate. The petition was granted, and the schools were established. Fosbroke declares that this marks the beginning of "Grammar-Schools, properly so called."¹⁶ One of the schools founded as the result of this petition later became the famous Mercers' School.

Gascoigne tells us that, in 1450 and before, members of the court complained to the king that certain preachers were inciting the people to insurrection by preaching against the corruption of the king's ministers, the injustice of the law courts, both civil and ecclesiastical, and other vices of the times. Among these preachers, says Gascoigne, were Gilbert Worthington, William Lichfield, and Peter of Beverly. In other words, these men were accused of stirring up the discontent which culminated in Jack Cade's rebellion and other popular uprisings in various parts of England. It appears, then, that Lichfield and other preachers openly attacked the vices of those in authority; but the accusation that they were responsible for the insurrection was, of course, only an attempt of

¹³ *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1441-1446), p. 460; see also *ibid.* (1446-1452), p. 103. For an account of this projected foundation, see John Peile, *Christ's College*, pp. 1 ff.

¹⁴ *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1446-1452), p. 29.

¹⁵ T. Brewer, *Memoir of the Life and Times of John Carpenter*, pp. 62 and 63; and B. B. Orridge, *Some Account of the Citizens of London and their Rulers*, p. 21.

¹⁶ T. D. Fosbroke, *Encyclopaedia of Antiquities*, I, 395, article on "Free Schools."

the corrupt ministers to shift upon others the blame for the consequences of their own misdeeds.¹⁷

Lichfield numbered among his friends a number of interesting men. He was a beneficiary to the extent of twenty shillings in the will of John Carpenter, the author of the *Liber Albus* and for many years clerk of London; and he and Reginald Pecock were selected by Carpenter to carry out one of the provisions of the will.¹⁸ Lichfield and Pecock were again associated, in 1446, in the founding of the gild at New Braynford (see above). It appears, then, that at this time the two men were friends. Later, however, after Pecock's sermon at Paul's Cross and his writings had brought him into conflict with the ecclesiastical authorities, Lichfield became one of his most active opponents.¹⁹ From the connection of Lichfield with John Somerset in the New Braynford foundation, we may also infer that he was on more or less intimate terms with this famous physician, mathematician, and grammarian, and chancellor of the exchequer. Associated with Lichfield in his various activities were also a number of well-known London preachers, among whom were Gilbert Worthington, rector of St. Andrew, Holborne; William Bingham, rector of St. John Zachary; John Cote, rector of St. Peter, Cornhill; and John Neel, rector of St. Mary Colechurch.

From the facts now available, we are able to form a fair estimate of Lichfield's character and activities. His ability as a poet is proved by his *Complaint*, which shows sincere religious feeling, and in technique is at least as good as the work of some of the better known fifteenth century writers. That he was an industrious maker of sermons is testified by the collection of 3,083 which he left at his death. As a preacher, he was a fearless opponent in the pulpit of the corrupt ministers of the king. He was "a good prechour and an holy man," says a contemporary chronicler in recording his death.²⁰ But the most prominent feature in the notices here collected is his interest in education. He was a bene-

¹⁷ J. E. T. Rogers, *Loci e Libro Veritatum*, pp. xlv, liii, and liv; 188 ff.

¹⁸ T. Brewer, *op. cit.*, pp. 138 and 143. This John Carpenter is not the same man as the John Carpenter, mentioned above, rector of St. Mary Magdalene, who later became Bishop of Worcester.

¹⁹ J. E. T. Rogers, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

²⁰ C. L. Kingsford, *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century*, p. 296.

factor of Queen's College, Cambridge, and was one of the trustees of the proposed new college of Godeshous at Cambridge. In addition, he was one of the founders of the four grammar schools in London which are said to mark the beginning of free grammar schools in England.

WALTER K. SMART.

*Armour Institute of Technology,
Chicago.*

THE 'DOLEFUL LAY OF CLORINDA'

In the collection of elegies in memory of Sir Philip Sidney, led off by Spenser's *Astrophel*, the second is ascribed by Spenser himself to 'Clorinda,' Sir Philip's sister, Mary, Countess of Pembroke,

Which least I marre the sweetness of the vearse,
In sort as she it sung I will rehearse.

All editors have accepted this ascription, as Spenser apparently intended that it should be accepted, until Mr. de Selincourt, in the one-volume Oxford *Spenser* (p. xxxv, n. 2), briefly and cautiously recorded his opinion that the 'Doleful Lay' is Spenser's own, chiefly because it is doubtful that Countess Mary could have achieved its "peculiarly Spenserian effects of rhythm and melody." In *Mod. Lang. Notes* for February, 1916 (xxxI, 79-82), Dr. Percy W. Long supports this opinion by showing the strong resemblance to Spenser's practice in the use of the colon after the second line of the stanza, by remarking that such ascription is common in Spenser's time and actually occurs in his *Ruins of Time*, and by pointing out a few resemblances in word and thought to Spenser's verse.

When preparations were begun for the *Spenser Concordance* in 1907, I did not include this text. A hasty examination led me to the conclusion that it was at best but a feebler imitation of Spenser, wanting altogether the vigor and fullness of tone even of *Astrophel*. As the work progressed and I grew more familiar with the Spenserian cadence, another examination might have reversed my opinion. Certainly had I taken the trouble to index the poem, the Spenserian authorship would, I believe, have been at once apparent. Almost every phrase, combination, and mannerism in it, not to say the little thought which it contains, is found elsewhere in Spenser,

especially in his elegiac verse. I subjoin a long list of these details, most of them gathered by Mr. Richard M. Hewitt, of the Graduate College, Princeton.

Line 1. 'Ay me!' Cf. l. 66. So begin *S. C. N.* 6;¹ *Gn.* 353; *Hub.* 601; *T. M.* 43; *I.* vi. 36. 7; vii. 1. 1; *II.* i. 44; *III.* ii. 33. 1; vii. 50. 1; *IV.* vii. 11. 1; ix. 38. 5; *V.* vi. 10. 8; x. 23. 1; xii. 50. 9; *VI.* vi. 13. 5; vii. 38. 9; *H. L.* 294; *H. H. L.* 178.

'Shall I my case complaine.' 'My case I thus complaine,' *Gn.* Ded. 3; same phrase, *Hub.* 1208; *T. M.* 421.

2. 'Compassion my impatient grieffe.' Compassion, v., only at *T. M.* 346, in similar phrase. We find 'impatient pain(s)' at *Gn.* 628; *VI.* vi. 8. 6; 'impatient plight,' *T. M.* 44; 'regret,' *As.* 169; 'smart,' *II.* i. 45. 5; etc.

3. 'Unfold my inward paine.' So 'unfold the anguish of your hart,' *I.* vii. 40. 6, and similar uses of 'unfold,' *D.* 74; *II.* i. 46. 7; *IV.* xii. 6. 1; etc.—some eighteen all told. 'Inward paine,' at *II.* i. 42. 9; *V.* vi. 19. 2. We find some seven instances of 'inward grief'; also 'inward gall,' *I.* ii. 6. 4; 'anguish,' *As.* 206; 'woe,' *As.* interl. 225; 'smart,' *T. M.* 422; 'sorrow,' *Ti.* 472; etc.

4. 'My enriuen heart.' Cf. 'enriuen side,' *V.* viii. 34. 9. 'Find remedy' occurs at *Hub.* 57; *III.* ii. 36. 2; etc.; 'find redress' at *III.* vi. 40. 7; etc.

5. 'Heavenly powres.' Also at *Gn.* 578; *D.* 198; *VII.* vi. 20. 1; 36. 2. Cf. *VII.* vi. 11. 7; vii. 3. 6; 5. 4.

6. 'Earthly men.' Also at *V.* i. 5. 8, and many instances of 'earthly wight,' 'race,' 'brood,' etc.

An interrogative stanza similar to the first is *T. M.* 43-8. The anaphoristic form of stanzas 1-3 is not unlike that of *D.* 393 ff.; *U. V.* throughout.

7. 'To heavens?' Cf. *D.* 354-5. 'They, alas!' Cf. *Pet.* i. 11; ii. 8; *Ti.* 652; etc.

7, 8. 'Authors were And workers of my unremedied wo.' 'Author' in this sense with an abstract noun is the prevailing use in Spenser. Cf. 'his owne woes author,' *II.* v. 1. 8; author of 'her wofull time,' *VI.* vii. 33. 3; also 'worker of her woe,' *IV.* xii. 29. 2; add *Gn.* 631; *Hub.* 1379; *Mui.* 244; *III.* xii. 31. 7; etc.

8. 'Unremedied.' Not found elsewhere, but see 'to remedie my paine,' *T. M.* 423; cf. *VI.* vi. 1. 9; xii. 8. 2.

10. 'Suffed this be so. 'Suffer' is usual with 'to,' but without at *II.* viii. 48. 9; *III.* vi. 19. 5.

11. 'From them comes good, from them comes also ill.' Similar cadence at *Am.* xlvi. 14.

12. 'Who then can save what they the heavens dispose to spill?' *Mui.* 232. The whole stanza is close in thought to that in *Mui.* and may be compared with *III.* iii. 2.

¹ The abbreviations are those used in the *Concordance*.

13. 'Like wretched.' Cf. I. x. 62. 4.

14-5. For 'heavens' decree' see *Ro.* vi. 11; *Gn.* 471, 569; III. iii. 41. 7; V. viii. 44. 6. 'Ordinance' in exactly this sense is not used elsewhere by Spenser.

16. 'Their best redresse is their best sufferance.' A similar thought at *D.* 386-8; cf. also the phrase at *S. C. S.* 127; III. xi. 16. 1; 17. 9.

17-8. 'How then can they, like wretched, comfort mee?' Similar wording at *Ti.* 23; and similar echo of 'comfort' at *T. M.* 349, 50; I. x. 41. 2, 3; III. v. 27. 4.

19. 'To my selfe will I my sorrow mourne.' Similar wording at *T. M.* 107, 473, 533; *D.* 507. 'Mourne' is usually intr. in Spenser but there are some half dozen exceptions.

21. 'Back return' is a favorite combination in Spenser, recurring again and again; cf. VI. ii. 12. 1.

22. 'Pay their usury with doubled paines.' 'Pay usury' also at VI. viii. 9. 9; *Epith.* 33; cf. 'dubble usury,' *Col.* 39; 'dubble losse,' *D.* 223; 'griefe,' I. ii. 34. 5; 'dread,' I. vi. 10. 1, etc.; 'double was his paines,' II. ii. 25. 9.

23-4. 'The woods, the hills, the rivers shall resound The mournfull accent of my sorrowes ground.' Woods are thus variously combined in Spenser, usually in threes, most often with hills, but also with meadows, *Mui.* 153; with fields and floods, *Col.* 29; valleys, *Col.* 482; cf. V. viii. 41. 5; VI. iii. 26. 6; 3. 6; VII. vi. 37. 2. The pastoral convention of mourning woods is used at *S. C. Au.* 166 — 'the wild woddes my sorrowes to resound'; cf. *S. C. Jun.* 95; *Au.* 151; *Col.* 23; *Epith.* 10. For resounding woods see *S. C. Au.* 159; *Ti.* 325; *D.* 331; I. vi. 7. 6; 14. 2; viii. 11. 9; II. iii. 20. 9; VI. iv. 10. 5; xi. 26. 6; VII. vi. 52. 8; *Am.* xix. 7; the refr. of *Epith.*

24. 'Mournfull accent.' 'Doleful accent,' VI. viii. 3. 9; cf. *T. M.* 286; *D.* 297; *Epith.* 351. 'Sorrowes ground'; cf. 'ground of all our woe,' III. v. 9. 9; 'of grief,' IV. ix. 15. 2.

26. 'Sith he is gone.' Similar phrasing at II. iii. 3. 2; VI. ii. 15. 1; xi. 20. 6; 27. 'All the fields do waile.' The fields mourn at *Ro.* xii. 3; *Col.* 25. 'Widow state' does not occur. Cf. 'widow queen,' VI. ii. 29. 1.

28. 'Death their fairest flowre did late deface.' Cf. 'My fresh flowretts bene defast,' *S. C. F.* 182; 'all fairest things on earth deface,' *T. M.* 434. 'Deface,' esp. with an auxiliary, often closes the line and cadence in Spenser.

29. 'Fairest flowre in field.' Cf. *S. C. N.* 83; IV. x. 22. 3. The figure is that of *As.* 181 ff., and part of the reminiscence of the Adonis myth in Bion which underlies that poem. See R. Shafer, *M. L. N.* 28. 224-6. Cf. III. 1. 34. 4.

30. 'That was.' Same use at *S. C. N.* 93; II. i. 50. 1.

31. 'Cruell hand of cursed foe.' Cf. 'Cursed felon high did reare His cruell hand,' V. xii. 20. 2. 'Cruel hand(s)' occurs some twenty times; 'cursed foe' at I. x. 63. 9.

32. 'Cropt the stalke.' Same phrase, *Proth.* 38. 'So faire a flowre'; cf. *D.* 237.

33. 4. 'Untimely.' 'All other fayre, lyke flowres, untymely fade,' *Am.* lxxix. 14; cf. *S. C. F.* 177; *III.* ii. 31. 8; *V.* vii. 33. 6. 'Cleane defaced'; same phrase, *Ded. Son.* xi. 11; *V.* x. 25. 4. 'Untimely hour(s),' *D.* 336; *V.* vi. 3. 5.

35. 6. 'Great losse.' Cf. *Col.* 16; *I.* vii. 27. 6.

37. 'Breake now your gyrlonds, O ye shepheards lasses.' So 'breaking quite his garlond,' *III.* xi. 37. 8. Cf. *S. C. D.* 114; *III.* iv. 30. 1. 'Shepherd lasses' lament at *D.* 222, 316.

42. 'Bitter elder, broken from the bowe.' So 'bringen bitter eldre braunches seare,' *S. C. N.* 147.

43. 'Ne ever sing the love-layes which he made.' So 'sing no moe The songs that Colin made,' *S. C. N.* 77. 'Love-layes' and like combinations (cf. 1. 44) are common in Spenser; cf. *S. C.* Jun. 13; *T. M.* 413; *Col.* 3, 387, 423; *As.* 35; *II.* vi. 14. 9; *III.* x. 8. 4.

45. 'Read the riddles.' Same phrase, *Gn. Ded.* 7; *V.* xi. 25. 5.

46. 'Make you mery glee.' Cf. 'to make their sports and merrie glee,' *VI.* ix. 41. 2; cf. *S. C. D.* 139; *II.* viii. 6. 9; *VII.* vii. 39. 1. The phrase 'make glee' at *S. C.* May 282; *I.* ix. 14. 1; *VI.* i. 46. 3; *viii.* 37. 1; *ix.* 4. 2; *x.* 10. 8.

47. 'Mery glee is now laid all abed.' So 'All that goodly glee . . . Is layd abed,' *T. M.* 181.

48. 'Mery maker' not elsewhere, but 'merry-make' occurs four times. 'Alasse! is dead.' So *S. C. N.* 58; cf. 38.

49. 'Worlds delight.' Same at *I.* vii. 39. 1; *V.* xi. 62. 5; *Com. Son.* iv. 10; *H. B.* 16.

50. 'Robbed you and reft fro me my joy.' Cf. 'Robbed of sense, and ravished with joy,' *Ti.* 321; 'Him of life, and us of joy hath reft,' *I.* vi. 39. 6.

52. 'Hath robd of joyance, and left sad annoy.' Cf. 'Is this the timely joy . . . now turnd to sad annoy,' *VI.* iii. 4. 9; cf. *III.* vi. 24. 7. 'Annoy' is a favorite word with Spenser in the close of a cadence.

53. 'Joy of the world.' Cf. *S. C. Au.* 193; *Ti.* 303; *I.* vii. 39. 1. 'Shepheards pride' occurs at *S. C. N.* 198; *Col.* 439.

54. 'Hope never like againe to see.' Similar phrase at *II.* xi. 40. 9, and elsewhere.

55. 'Such riches.' Sidney was also the 'worldes chiefst riches' at *Ti.* 675.

58. 'Shadow of his likenesse.' 'Shadow' in like sense at *III.* viii. 10. 8; *V.* ix. 27. 5; *Am.* xxxv. 14.

60. 'Like a shade.' So. *VII.* vii. 46. 4.

61-4. Same figure of mortal of angelic race adorned with celestial grace, applied to Lady Douglas Howard, *D.* 211-7. See n. on ll. 67-90. 'Immortal spirit' at *Ti.* 673; *H. B.* 107. 'Celestial grace' at *Ti.* 289; *D.* 211; *II.* iii. 25. 6; *III.* vi. 4. 7.

62. 'Deckt With all the dowries of celestially grace.' Cf. 'Adorn'd with . . . all the dowries of a noble mind,' *D.* 216.

63. 'Souveraine choyce.' So 'sovereign (= divine) grace,' *H. B.* 17; 'bounty,' *H. H. L.* 223; 'mercy,' *H. H. L.* 257, and a dozen others.

64. 'Lineally deriv'd.' Similar phrase at *III.* iv. 3. 9; ix. 36. 1; 38. 7, etc. 'From angels race.' Same phrase at *D.* 213, and same idea, a favorite with Spenser, at *IV.* iii. 39. 7; *Am.* lxi. 6; *Proth.* 66; cf. *I.* iii. 8. 9; *III.* iii. 22. 8.

67. 'It is not dead, ne can it die.' For phrasing see *Ti.* 260; *IV.* iii. 30. 6.

68. 'Lives for aie in blisfull Paradise.' Cf. 'live for aye above,' *Ti.* 396; 'with Him to live for ay,' *D.* 236; also *L.* 403; *II.* x. 40. 1.

67-90. This Platonic passage, with modifications in the manner of Apuleius, is wholly Spenserian. See the very similar apotheosis at *H. L.* 273-93. These are not wanting in reminiscence of the Adonis myth: cf. *III.* i. 34-6, and notes on lines 29 and 88. For the 'forms' and 'aspects' in Venus' heavenly house see *III.* vi. 12. 1-5, of which the thought is essentially the same as that reflected in lines 60-4 of this poem.

70. 'Bed of lillies' also at *II.* iii. 22. 6; v. 32. 3. Lilies are associated with roses and violets at *Gn.* 667; *Proth.* 30-3. 'Wrapt' in this sense is common in Spenser.

70-2. 'In bed of lillies wrapt,' etc. With this, the best passage of the poem, cf. 'In her bed her lay; Lay her in lillies and violets,' *Epith.* 301-2.

73. 'Thousand birds.' Cf. *VII.* vii. 28. 4. 'Celestial brood.' Cf. similar phrases cited in note on line 64.

74. 'Caroll day and night.' So 'caroling her name both day and night,' *VI.* ix. 9. 8.

75. 'Strange notes.' Also at *III.* xii. 6. 2. 'Well understood,' at *D.* 176; *VI.* ii. 44. 2; iv. 12. 7; *Am.* xlvi. 3.

76. 'Lull him a sleep.' The phrase common in Spenser—*S. C.* Au. 155; N. 4; *D.* 71; etc. With the whole line cf. 'In the lap of soft delight Beene long time luld,' *T. M.* 301; also *III.* Pr. 4. 9; 'Angelick' so stressed at *Am.* lxxxiii. 8. 78. 'Immortall beauties, which no eye may see.' Cf. *H. H. B.* 13. The idea is frequent in the four hymns.

80. 'Appearing plaine.' Common in Spenser—I. ii. 39. 2; *II.* xii. 64. 7; *IV.* vi. 29. 7; xi. 1. 7; etc.

81. Kindling love in him above all measure.' A combination of phrases found in *I.* ix. 9. 4; *VII.* vii. 45. 3; *H. H. B.* 5; and *IV.* ix. 21. 4.

82. 'Sweet love' occurs a dozen times. Such sharp juxtaposition of pain and pleasure is frequent; cf. *III.* viii. 2. 4.

83. 'Goodly forme.' Also at *Van.* iii. 6; *V.* iii. 25. 8.

84. 'Jealous rancor.' Cf. 'With fell rancor or fond gealosy,' *III.* i. 18. 2.

85. 'There liveth he in everlasting blis.' Cf. 'Where he now liveth in eternall blisse,' *Ti.* 265; same at III. vi. 48. 1; 'live in lasting blisse,' IV. x. 23. 5.

88. 'Salvage beasts.' Also at *As.* 82; I. iii. 42. 2, etc.—some dozen times. The line is another reminiscence of the Adonis myth of *As.*

89. 'Wretches, waile his private lack.' Similar phrasing at I. v. 45. 9; III. iv. 38. 6. With objective 'his' cf. 'her lacke,' *D.* 368; 'thy lacke,' *Col.* 17.

90. 'Vaine vowes.' So at I. xxi. 19. 6; II. xi. 18. 8; IV. iv. 16. 6.

91. With this contrast cf. 'More happie thou, and wretched wee,' *Ti.* 330. 'Happie, happie spirit.' Cf. 'Live, happie spirits,' *Ro.* Env. 13; also *Ti.* 295; IV. ii. 34. 1. 'Happy' is often reiterated in Spenser.

92. 'Give us leave thee here thus to lament.' So 'Give leave to him . . . to lament his losse,' *Ti.* 676.

93. 'Thy heavens joy inherit.' Cf. 'To highest heaven, where now he doth inherite All happinesse,' *Ti.* 383: 'heavenly tabernacles there inherit,' *Epith.* 422. 'Heavens joy'; cf. *Ti.* 303.

94. 'In dole are drent.' Cf. 'in dolour drent,' *T. M.* 210.

95. 'Weep and waile' is frequent in Spenser often with a third member: *T. M.* 598; *As.* 207; *Am.* xviii. 13. 'Wear our eies' does not occur elsewhere, but those in affliction wear the night, V. vi. 26. 1; days, IV. viii. 15. 7; years, *Hub.* 59.

After so tedious, though incomplete a list of parallels, there can be no doubt that the 'dolefull lay of Clorinda' is in its finest fibre Spenserian. Only three words not found in the Concordance occur in the poem—'unremedied' (8), 'merry-maker' (48), 'devourer' (49), and each of these is essentially represented there by corresponding noun or verb.

Yet for all its Spenserian word and phrase and cadence, it is below the quality of even the poet's most perfunctory verse, not only, as I have said, in tone and timbre, but in movement and import. Though Spenser at times is repetitious, I do not recall that elsewhere he is so ineffectively so as in lines 25 to 60. I cannot help thinking that this alteration of his natural melody was deliberate. Dr. Long cites what he considers an analogous case of impersonation by the poet in *Daphnaida*, where Spenser laments in the person of Arthur Gorges. There seems, however, to be this difference between that instance and the one before us, that no one was ever deceived by the impersonation of Gorges, and every one for three hundred years and more has been deceived by this of Clorinda. The first was a clear instance of transparent impersona-

tion; whereas in the case of Clorinda the lament, though separated from *Astrophel* only by a large initial, appears in close association with other laments acknowledged by their various authors. When, therefore, Spenser says that she began her lay

Which, least I marre the sweetness of the vearse,
In sort as she it sung I will rehearse,

he means to deceive as many of his own generation and succeeding ones as he can, and one must admit that he has been fairly, and, as it now seems, strangely successful.

To this end he attempted a qualification and cloaking of his natural tone to something more feminine and tenuous, and he has this in mind when he says, 'least I marre the sweetnesse of the vearse, In sort as she it sung.' This alteration will be more easily perceived by one who sympathetically reads aloud in succession the *Astrophel* and the 'Doleful Lay,' together with the interlude of two stanzas, which are obviously Spenser's own. With exquisite effect his usual energy is tempered in the three lovely lines:

In bed of lillies wrapt in tender wise,
And compast all about with roses sweet,
And daintie violets from head to feet.

Any comparison of the 'Doleful Lay' with the very few original poems by the Countess Mary points directly to her innocence of it.² The only other pastoral attributed to her is found in the Davisons' *Poetical Rhapsody*, ed. A. H. Bullen, 1. 40-2. It is *A Dialogue between two Shepherds, Thenot and Piers, in praise of Astrea*, and a note in the first edition says that it was 'made by the excellent Lady, the Lady Mary Countess of Pembroke, at the Queen Majesty's being at her house at —, Anno 15**.' It is thought to have been written in anticipation of a visit which never took place. At all events the Countess would have done her best against such an occasion, but the poem not only bears no resemblance to the lay, but reveals nothing of the peculiar cleverness which would have been necessary to so close and skilful an imitation of Spenser as the poet seems to have made of himself.

CHARLES G. OSGOOD.

Princeton University.

² On her works see A. Luce, *The Countess of Pembroke's Antonie*, Weimar, 1897, pp. 1-38.

SHELLEY'S ODE TO THE WEST WIND

Why did Shelley choose the West Wind, and set it apart from and above all the rest in his great ode?

It is easy to understand why wind in the abstract,—any strong, swift, masterful wind,—must have had an especial attraction for a poet of Shelley's temperament. He recognized that there was something in his own uncontrolled nature originally akin to a creature so "tameless and swift and proud." Shelley, moreover, was peculiarly alive to the tireless energy, the incessant and intricate activity of force in creation, and for him the different forms in which this protean activity manifested itself had a positive personality. The dull, dense mass of matter is constantly represented by him as "plastic,"—as being outwardly changed, or shaped, or driven by force, or spirit. The cloud, in the poem which we naturally associate with the *Ode to the West Wind*, is brought before us living and acting, and our thoughts are directed to it as a force in the moving scheme of things. As a poet of Nature, Shelley is thus often dynamic when even Wordsworth is comparatively static. Shelley is absorbed in the thought of Nature at work and he views the world not merely as a visionary appearance mysteriously illuminated with the indwelling Divine life, but as the shifting expression of underlying and interacting forces, which he individualizes as personal powers.

But while this may explain Shelley's sense of kinship to the wind, his preference for the West Wind remains to be accounted for.

We know that the *Ode* was not a purely imaginative production; it was not suggested by the thought of the West Wind in general. It was the outcome of a definite personal experience, which Shelley describes with some minuteness in his note to the poem. The *Ode* "was conceived and chiefly written," Shelley tells us "in a wood that skirts the Arno near Florence." A "tempestuous" West Wind had been blowing throughout the day, and "at sunset" there was "a violent tempest of hail and rain, attended by that magnificent thunder and lightning peculiar to the Cisalpine regions." Shelley seems to have spent the greater part of the day out-of-doors, absorbed by the power and magnificence of the spectacle, and the im-

mediate source of his inspiration is not the storm, impressive as it was, but the work of the West Wind at a certain time and place. But while it is true that the immediate inspiration is thus concrete and local, the poem gains breadth from the fact that Shelley rises from his thought of one particular manifestation of the power of the West Wind, to the conception of the power of the West Wind in general, to an appreciation of its personality and its peculiar office and place in the wider life of the natural world. It is only when we study the poem from what we may call the meteorological aspect, that we arrive at a full sympathy with the poet's idea.

We must remember that the *Ode* was composed in a region ruled throughout the greater part of the year by the westerly winds. During the Summer, the wind often sweeps into Italy hot and dry from the South, but with the Autumnal equinox comes the West wind from the Atlantic, heavy with moisture and putting Summer to rout with storms and Autumnal rains. It is this "wild, west wind" whose coming means the end of Summer, that is first invoked. Shelley's whole nature is roused and exalted not only by the power of the wind, or the violence of the storm; he is fascinated by the realization that he is present at a turning point in the life of the year. From his post in a wood near the Arno, he watches the West Wind gather his forces for the final victory. Through the day this "tempestuous wind whose temperature is at once mild and animating, was collecting the vapors which pour down the Autumnal rains." By sunset, as the poet anticipated, all things were ready for the final contest and then followed that "violent tempest" which marked the end of Summer, the beginning of the rainy season, and the assumption of his kingdom by the West Wind, that is literally the very "breath of Autumn's being."

But the West Wind has a double significance for the poet. On the western coast of Italy it performs two strikingly contrasted missions; it ends the Summer, but it also brings in the Spring. During the early part of February, the conqueror of Summer returns to conquer Winter; it comes to bring life as, a few months earlier, it has brought death. Few passages in Latin poetry are more familiar, or more charming, than those which celebrate the return of *Favonius*, or *Zephyrus*, this favorable (*faveo*), or life-bringing wind of the Spring. Lucretius pays his tribute to "winged Zephyrus," "veris praenuntius" (*De Rerum Nat.* 5. 737); and Vergil (*Georg.* 1. 44.), Catullus (46. 2.), and Horace (*Car.* 1. 4. and 4. 7.)

are among those who join in the chorus of praise. The moderns follow the lead of the ancients, and Chaucer pictures Zephyrus reviving the "tender croppes" with his "sweete Breethe," or Milton looks forward to the time when Favonius will reinspire the frozen earth.

Now Shelley invokes the West Wind of Autumn, but while the dead leaves are driven before it and the storm is approaching, there rises before him a vision of the West Wind of the Spring. Shelley's tribute to this Spring West Wind is not only charming, perhaps above all the others, in its delicate grace, and wealth of poetic suggestion, but so far as I can recall, it differs in one respect from all the rest. To him, this wind of the blue vernal heaven, is the "azure sister" of the rough wind of Autumn. She is the feminine complement of the same power, working with her "impetuous" brother by bringing to life the "winged seeds" which he has "charioted" to their wintry beds, and so preserved. The West Wind is thus glorified above other winds, because of its office as "destroyer and preserver"; because this wind which drives the dead leaves to corruption, is akin to that other West Wind which quickens the dreaming earth to life.

Up to this point, or throughout the first division of the poem, Shelley has been chiefly occupied with the West Wind's task on the earth, as he watched it visibly at work around him, or as he went beyond the present and imagined it coming in the Spring. The second division treats of the Wind in the heaven, and here he is still thinking of its local and apparent activity as it is present before his eyes. But in the third part, he leaves his particular point of observation, his thought passes beyond the wood with its trees stripped of leaves, its heaven of flying cloud, its signs of the coming storm, and his imagination takes a wider flight. He sees the West Wind at work on the water, as he has seen its impress on earth and sky. He sees it as in a vision troubling the water off the coast many miles to the Southward, rousing the tranquil Mediterranean from his summer dreams, and then, detaching himself more completely from its local and special manifestations, he follows it in its course across the expanse of ocean. He invokes the wind—

For whose path the Atlantic's level powers
Cleave themselves into chasms.

Is this solemn invocation addressed to a wind that merely hap-

pened to come from the West, and which therefore must have passed over the Atlantic? Does not Shelley rather recognize here, as throughout the *Ode*, the personality and the especial office of the wind he is addressing? The passage just quoted seems hardly applicable to a wind whose activities are merely local, temporal, and incidental. Winds shift and veer, but over a certain region of the North Atlantic the West Wind is King. A "turbulent ruler," as Joseph Conrad calls him in his sailor-like study of the East and West winds in his *Mirror of the Sea*, but nevertheless a beneficent one. It is this masterful wind, the rain-bringing wind, that has made the British Isles and Northwestern Europe what they are; it is this wind that is the home-coming wind of Conrad's sketch and of Tennyson's lullaby—the "wind of the Western sea." "The narrow seas around these isles," Conrad writes, "where British admirals keep watch and ward upon the marches of the Atlantic ocean, are subject to the turbulent sway of the west wind. Clothed in a mantle of dazzling gold and draped in rags of black clouds like a beggar, the might of the Westerly Wind sits enthroned upon the Western horizon with the whole North Atlantic as a footstool for his feet, and the first twinkling stars making a diadem for his brow." Shelley's invocation to the West Wind as one whose path is across the level Atlantic, gains in meaning when we remember that the West Wind does not traverse it as an alien adventurer, as a maurader from without, he moves over it as a king in his royal progress. Circling the globe in this northern belt as he does in the southern, this region of the "roaring forties" is a king's highway ordained and set apart for him.

To Shelley, then, the western wind had a definite character and office. Tameless, swift, proud, uncontrollable, even fierce—it was yet above all the spirit of power; the spirit that in sweeping away the old brought in the new, the wind that was both radical and conservative, both destroyer and preserver; that showed us death as but a transitional phase of life. May we not say that if Shelley had written an ode to any other wind, while it might have been equally good, it would, of necessity, have been utterly different. His words apply to this particular wind and to no other, for in this matter also—

The east is east and the west is west,
And never the twain shall meet.

Chestnut Hill, Pa.

HENRY S. PANCOAST.

REVIEWS

The Power of Dante. By C. H. GRANDGENT, L. H. D. Boston: Marshall Jones Company, 1918. 248 pp.

In the first of this series of lectures Professor Grandgent answers the question: "What . . . is the source of Dante's enduring power?" and concludes that, while the mediæval mind was probably attracted chiefly by the allegory and the instruction to be derived from the works of Dante, the modern reader is attracted and impressed rather by the Faith, Morality, Temperament, Experience, Vision, Conception, Workmanship, Diction of the author, attributes which are manifest in his works, and which provide the titles for these eight lectures.

The answer is artificially framed, and would seem to ignore the fact—which perhaps seemed too obvious to state—that the one chief cause of the enduring power of Dante's works is their great beauty, which has consciously or unconsciously affected people of all times, and without which no degree of cleverness and no number of good qualities in the author would have availed to produce that effect. The great beauty of the works consists in the expression of larger and clearer intuitions of truth than are to be found elsewhere, and is its own explanation. In it consists the personality of the author as far as we can know it, and for this reason expressions which seem to mean that Mr. Grandgent has ransacked the works for information about the author, or which consider Dante's intellectual side separately from his artistic side (*cf.* pp. 67-68), seem to me unhappy. What Mr. Grandgent has done is to describe and interpret the beauty of the works, often in subtle detail, and this he has done so well that it need not concern us much that he has placed the whole in a conventional frame, and frequently seems to pretend that he is speaking less of the works than of the person who centuries ago happened to write them. These lectures are models of clarity and economy in choosing the essential and neglecting the unessential. We see here that talent for sobriety which was so well illustrated in the introductions to the *cantiche* and *cantos* of the

Divine Comedy in the American edition—a talent which is also particularly Dantesque, and how can one praise it more?

The first lecture, on *Faith*, presents us with Dante's own examination in the *Paradise*, followed by a clear exposition of the doctrine of justice, which is the will of God; the reconciliation of free will and predestination, with its limitations; the mystery of the unity and universality of God; that of the Trinity, and of the divinity and humanity of Christ. Then follows the mystery of the creation, —and perhaps it would have been well to explain that here we have the solution of the doubt expressed in the *Convivio* regarding the origin of "prima materia"—and then the fall of the angels and of man, and the redemption of man, whose actual salvation depends on his state of mind at the moment of death, a matter well illustrated by the different fate of Federico and Buonconte da Montefeltro.

The second lecture, *Morality*, expounds Dante's view of sin and the responsibility that depends on freedom of choice. Evil is real; we are attracted to it only when it seems good to us—perhaps this latter point might have been made clearer—but we have a conscience to warn us that we are being deceived, and if we choose against the advice of conscience we are guilty. "Temptation is man's lot. Without it indeed, he would have no active free will, because there would be no choice to make." Temptation, however, for the souls in Purgatory, is not the same thing as for souls on earth, so that the episode of the serpent in Purgatory is not so good an illustration as Dante's vision of the siren, both of which are given as examples. In the latter, Vergil representing Reason exposes the siren, but the relation between Reason and Conscience is not explained. Excellent is the explanation of the necessity of Dante's journey through Hell and Purgatory, and that of the classes of sins in the two realms. Dante "seems to have regarded pride as his besetting sin," it is said (p. 54), and if so it must have been pride of intellect rather than pride of art and of birth, if we are to judge by the words of *Purg.*, xxvi, 19-24, which precede the approach of Diomed and Ulysses; but what of the fire that purges "lussuria," through which the poet is obliged to pass? The emotional effects of the various penalties are carefully valued, for example, the ridiculous quality of sins committed for money; and it might be added that the mutilation, as well as the distortion, of the

human form is clothed with a peculiar horror: cf. the canto of Bertrand de Born as well as the punishment of the soothsayers (p. 62).

In the third lecture, *Temperament*, certain mental attributes in the *Comedy* and the other works are studied as characteristics of the poet: his "intensity," curiosity, and consequent "ardent study"; his intellectual honesty, righteous indignation, and hatred; his amorousness, gratitude, courtesy, and love of family life. The author sees in Dante's passage through the fire the allegory of his "rescue . . . from an unworthy passion"; but since the office of that fire is to purge souls of the vicious tendency to lust, one might suppose that the episode only indicates that same tendency in Dante.

Mr. Grandgent believes that in the *Convivio* Dante is trying to represent his love for the "donna gentile" as purely allegorical. This matter is taken up again in more detail in the sixth lecture, *Conception*, where it is said that "it is evident that when Dante wrote the *Banquet*, he wished his readers to believe that *all* the verses were symbolical, that there never was a sympathetic lady of flesh and blood." To me this supposed intention is so far from "evident" that it seems incredible. The poet would be attempting to persuade his readers of something which many of them knew to be untrue. The allegorical interpretation of *Voi che intendendo* is here given in full (p. 180) and considered to the exclusion of the literal; but in the *Convivio* we have, besides the commentary on the literal sense, an introductory account of this love-affair, which refers the reader to the previous story in the *Vita Nuova*, and then continues and completes that story. This introductory account—like the other introduction which, later on, precedes the commentary on the allegorical sense—is evidently to be taken as a statement of facts. If Dante had meant, in the *Convivio*, to give the impression that the story of the *Vita Nuova* was allegorical, he could not have avoided explaining why, in the *Vita Nuova*, he had virtuously turned his back on the "donna gentile."

Mr. Grandgent says that in the "ballata" *Voi che sapete* "the fiction is still more obvious" than in *Voi che intendendo*. To me the latter part of the "ballata," which represents the lady as utterly pitiless, is intended to emphasize the changed attitude of the "donna gentile," who at first had been all pity. It would be interesting to know whether our author considers the sonnet *Parole*

mie (in which *Voi che intendendo* is quoted) and the answer to it, *O dolci rime*, as purely allegorical; the sum of the impression made by all these poems on me is that the love-affair with the "donna gentile" was not different from most love-affairs, that it had its episodes and disappointments.

Under the title *Experience* the fourth lecture illustrates the external information we have about the life and times of the poet, with the abundant light shed by the works, but it is in the remaining four lectures that the reader reaps the most advantage and pleasure from the "lungo studio e il grande amore" of the author. Under *Vision* we are shown with frequent and well-chosen examples the extraordinary lucidity of Dante's imagination, and how readily it was awakened by apparently insignificant items of his reading or, presumably, of his other experiences. Under *Conception* we see what the plan of the *Divine Comedy* owes to its main sources and to the poet's devoted love of symmetry and allegory, the latter illustrated in *Tre donne*, *Voi che intendendo*, *Amor che nella mente*, and *Voi che sapete*. The date of the *Vita Nuova* is given as 1293 or 1294 (pp. 156 and 166), without comment; a dating which is more than debatable.

The last two lectures, *Workmanship* and *Diction*, examine the technique of Dante's poetical art, and will help many readers to appreciate beauties they might easily miss. Dante's economy of words, symmetry, and adherence to plan—"the check of art"—in composing a poem, is excellently described, as are also his use of antithesis and dramatic climaxes; his faculty of arousing surprise, suspense, apprehension, curiosity, and his ability in suggesting mystery. The great difficulty in conveying an adequate impression of the musical qualities of the verse is overcome with the aid of well-chosen illustrations. In the account of Dante's rhetorical theory, full justice is not done to his definition of the "tragic style" (pp. 237-8 and 240-1), for it is not enough to explain "majesty of the lines," "construction," and "excellence of the words," without explaining what is meant by their "harmony" with "the gravity of the subject." It is this unifying "harmony" that makes the "tragic style," a term which includes both form and content,—or so it seems to those who agree with Vittorio Rossi in his article on the *Dolce stil nuovo*.

All the lectures are profusely illustrated by translations, most of

which are new, a few having already appeared in Mr. Grandgent's *Dante* (New York, 1916) and in *The Ladies of Dante's Lyrics* (Cambridge, 1917). They are worthy of the best tradition of New England translations of the poet, and how much greater is their enduring value than that of the stereopticon views which serve a similar purpose in many popular lectures! The prose translations are wonderfully accurate, perhaps too accurate sometimes, since the determination to be faithful leads now and then to awkward expressions such as "I am sweet Siren who bewitch sailors in mid sea" (p. 35), and "I lingered to stare at the crowd, and saw something which, without further proof, I should be afraid to tell unaccompanied" (p. 80).

Some of the translations, both in verse and prose, are open to criticism of the interpretation which informs them. The interpretation by Torraca of *Purg.*, v, 112-114, supported as it is by an appropriate passage from St. Thomas, seems to me far preferable to that adopted on p. 28. The words of *Purg.*, III, 124-126, are translated (p. 31):

And if Cosenza's shepherd, who was sped
By Clement on my track, revenge to reap,
That page of holy writ had rightly read,

but "holy writ" has not been referred to before, and I do not think that Dante intended to use that metaphor. The original "Avesse, in Dio, ben letta questa faccia" means, I think, 'had well perceived this aspect of God'; that is, the clemency of God, which is suggested by the Pope's name, "Clement." The verb *leggere* has here a Latin meaning like that of the Old French *choisir*. In "Ahi, Pisa, vituperio delle genti," "vituperio" probably means *dishonor, shame*, and if so "accursed of the peoples" (p. 120) is incorrect. "Would it might be thus" (p. 121) is probably a slip for 'would it were thus,' to translate "così foss' ei, da che pur esser dee!" Surely "cercar" in "Che m'han fatto cercar lo tuo volume" means *search*, not "seek out"? (p. 239). "I, looking, saw a banner, which ran circling so swift that it seemed scornful of all rest" (p. 45) preserves the generally accepted interpretation of "mi pareva indegna," but since Dante uses *indegno* also in the other sense, 'unworthy,' I cannot see why one should choose the less common meaning, which is incongruous here because it confers some dignity upon the personified "banner."

The translation I should prefer would be: 'it seemed condemned never to rest' (because judged unworthy of rest). On p. 239, Vergil "looks faint from long silence," a difficult expression to understand. He might *seem* faint, because he had hitherto remained silent, but it seems to me that the best interpretation would be *faint-voiced*, the first meaning in Italian. He seemed to be having difficulty in making himself heard, like one who had long been silent: allegorically the important thing is the *voice* of reason. The preposition "on" in "my sacred poem, *on* which Heaven and earth have set their hand" (p. 111), suggests a benediction, whereas the sense of the original is that heaven and earth have both contributed to the poem. The translation (p. 187):

A thing so strange that (by thy constant light!)
It never was conceived at any time.

may be correct; but, if so, the poet has used, in the second *che* of the sentence, an astonishingly colloquial construction. Probably "luce" is here a verb, and we should read 'forma' for "ferma." (Cf. *Il Canzoniere Vat. Barb. Lat.* 3953, ed. G. Lega, Bologna, 1905, p. 48, and *De Vulg. Eloq.*, II, 13.) "The speech of Vergil was the real ground" (p. 244) is no doubt a misprint for "Thy speech."

But if there are, here and there, opportunities for what may seem fretfully minute criticism, the verse translation as a whole is admirable, for it is not only good poetry; but in it are the spirit and music of Dante, which have become Mr. Grandgent's own. The poems are not all equally successful, but the difficulties of translation are varied. One may think that the expression "grassy leaves," and the choice of the word "lass" for "donna," which has necessarily to be repeated in every stanza of *Al poco giorno*, are not of the happiest, but it is a fact that to translate that "sestina" is almost to perform a miracle. Often the effect of the original is so like that of the English that one realizes with joy that reader and translator are sharing the intuition and the accompanying sensations that the author of the original must himself have had; for example (p. 225):

Now we had come where we could hear the drum
Of echoing waters tumbling down below,
Which rumbled like the busy beehive's hum.

Second only in difficulty to that of the "sestina" mentioned

above is the translation of *Io son venuto al punto della rota*, in which there is no resulting harshness (p. 191) :

The springs pour out their waters mistily,
 Pusht forth by vapors hidden down below,
 Which mother earth's abysses upward thrust.
 The path on pleasant days so sweet to me,
 Is now a running stream, and long shall flow;
 For while the winter warreth flow it must.
 Enamel-like the ground puts on a crust;
 And stagnant water quickly turns to glass,
 Lockt out of doors by petrifying frost.
 O song, what shall become of me when spring
 Shall come renewed and sweet, when Love shall fall
 Like rain from all the skies to hearts untold,
 If now, despite the cold,
 Love dwells in me, and nowhere else at all.

Less difficult externally, but delicately sympathetic, as the original demanded, is the following (p. 221) :

As harp or viol, tuned to harmony
 Of many strings, doth tinkle sweet and shy
 To one who catches not the melody,
 Thus from the lights appearing in the sky
 There swept along the Cross a strain of song
 That baffled sense, but lifted me on high.

And splendid, as in the original, which begins :

Ecco la fiera con la coda aguzza

is the swing and sound of the description of Gerion (p. 133) :

Behold the creature with the pointed tail,
 Which crosses mountains, shatters plate and wall—
 The one whose stench makes all the world to ail.

No better essays in translation of Dante have been written.

J. E. SHAW.

University of Toronto.

La Chançon de Willame, an edition of the unique manuscript of the poem with vocabulary and table of proper nouns. Edited by ELIZABETH STEARNS TYLER, M. A., Ph. D. New York, Oxford University Press, 1919.

It is peculiarly fitting that attention be called to this book, because in the summer of 1918 Dr. Tyler went to France to do Red Cross work and died there last February while stationed at Sedan. That this *Chançon de Willame*, whose most distinctive feature is the picture it gives of the heroic Guibure, should have found for its first American editor a woman, and a woman also capable of heroic deeds, is a striking coincidence.

The mere making available to students of French of this "complete edition of the *Chançon de Willame*" (p. vi, n.), is no small accomplishment. But Dr. Tyler deserves more than simple praise for having done this. "If this edition of the manuscript," she says (p. xvii), "will lead to a deeper study of the poem and to a wider appreciation—and enjoyment—of its beauty, the edition will have proved its *raison d'être*." The more seriously, therefore, we examine her work, the more we shall honor her.

For Dr. Tyler the *Chançon de Willame* is not, as for Suchier, simply the first 1982 lines, but the whole of the manuscript of 3356 lines, first published in a limited edition by the Chiswick Press in 1903. Dr. Tyler has compared this first edition with a facsimile of the manuscript, and given us a revised text with modern punctuation and capitalization, and the diacritical marks usually found in critical editions. The text is also emended "to suggest by means of notes, parentheses, and italics a smooth, comprehensible reading of the poem" (p. xiv), the "normal page" still keeping before the reader the text of the manuscript. Dr. Tyler has done, therefore, much more than is promised us by the editor of *Les Classiques Français du moyen âge*, who announced in 1913 (*Rom.*, p. 473) that there would appear in the near future an edition of the *Chançon de Willame* which would put "*à la disposition de tous les travailleurs le contenu du précieux manuscrit de Chiswick*."

In preparing her emendations, Dr. Tyler has, naturally, made use of the works of her predecessors. Her use of them has not, however, been servile, and it is much to her credit that we note from time to time a reading that appeals to us more even than

that of Suchier. We are glad to see that the first hemistich of line 485, for example: *ne vus esmaez*, has been emended to read: *n'esmaez vus*, following the suggestion of Rechnitz rather than of Suchier: *ne vus tameir*. Again in line 1636: "Sur els devom (nus) uostre maltalant turner," Dr. Tyler happily suggests *haiür* for *maltalant*, recalling perhaps the words of Ganelon in the Roland: "*Rollanz sis nies me coillit en haiür*." This seems decidedly preferable to Suchier's *faide*. The troublesome lines 474 to 483, inclusive, in which *a—e* and *e—e* assonances are mixed, Dr. Tyler presents as one *laisse* (LII), whereas Suchier makes two *laises* of them (LII and LIII). In consonance with this is Dr. Tyler's emendation of line 1832: "*E sun halberc li runt e desmaele*," to read: "*E sun halberc li desrunt e desmaillet*," even tho the twelve words in assonance with *desmaillet* all present an open *e*. Suchier emends the second hemistich: *li runt e desclavele*, recalling perhaps the line in the *Coven. Vivien*, 1,595: *E son hauberc desront et desclavele*. In many cases we should be glad if Dr. Tyler had added more notes explanatory of her readings, but as her primary purpose was to offer a text for those who "read for the story" (p. ix), these have been reduced to a minimum. In this particular case we can divine, as again in line 2130, where the same emendation is made under the same conditions, that Dr. Tyler believed that some irregularities might be allowed the old poet. She may have recalled that Gaston Paris in his *Extraits* of the *Chanson de Roland* leaves the word *main* in a *laisse* in *e* (l. 2264).

In line 836 I am tempted to see a purely typographical error in the note *geter*, altho the same form is again found in the Vocabulary (p. 161). Probably Suchier's suggestion *reter* was meant in both cases. It is difficult to see what *geter* added (?) to the "normal page" line would mean: *Allas, peccable, n'en puis, home gent!* whereas Suchier's emended line: *A, las, pechables, n'en puis home reter*, is at least formally correct and intelligible.

In line 254, the position of the quotation mark at the beginning of the line raises some interesting questions. Rechnitz interpreted lines 253-54:

Donc dist Tedbalz: "Qu'en löez, Viviiens,
De la bataille? Car ore ja vient bien."

allowing an *enjambement* as he does also in lines 570-71 and 747-48. Suchier likewise admits the *enjambement*, but recognizes the second hemistich of line 254 as the answer of Vivien: "*Ai or, ja l'avrum*

bien!" while the reading of Rechnitz leaves Vivien's question unanswered. Dr. Tyler, on the contrary, sees no *enjambement*, but makes the whole line Vivien's answer: "*De la bataille! Car ore l'avrum bien!*" When so long a step has been taken toward a critical edition by punctuation, it would seem easy to go a step farther and differentiate the vowel and consonant *u* and *i*. This would certainly have contributed to the popularizing of the text.

In line 1840: *Que l'os del col li bruse e esmuille*, it is not quite clear whether Dr. Tyler adopted Suchier's emendation, *esmoület* < *esmoüler* = "das Mark herausschlagen." At any rate we might very well consider *esmuille* the equivalent of *esmulle* < *ex* + *modulare* on the analogy of *demoller* = *disloquer*, which still lives in Rabelais: *Es aultres demolloyt les reins* (I, 27, cf. Godefroy, DEMOLER); or, still more closely, on the analogy of *desmoller*, *desmouler*, of which Godefroy gives only the form "*desmolé, -ollé, -oulé, = déformé, abîmé,*" but which is still in Oudin "*au sens de déformer*" (Dict. Gen., DEMOULER). The word *mollé* = well-formed, is twice found in the *Chançon* (ll. 2226, 2750), so that it would not be far-fetched to attribute to the poet the compound *esmoller*. We could then read the hemistich with the *li* of the manuscript: *li bruiset e esmulle* (cf. Suchier: *bruiset e esmoület*). In line 1902, where Dr. Tyler follows Suchier in making *escure* the same verb as the *escure* (< *escutere*) in lines 777 and 1216, we should like to read *escure* < *escurrere*, and read *cors* = *course* as in line 2878 of the *Roland*: *Descent a piet alez i est plein cors*. The meaning would seem more appropriate, especially because of the *Le cure leist* which follows:

"Li bers Willame vit le païen venir,
Le cors escure, la grant hanste brandir,
(E) il tint s'espée devant en mi le vis;
Dunce l'en esgarde li reis de Sarazins,
Le cure leist, al petit pas s'est mis."

In line 2887 *estorterez* is given in the vocabulary as from *estorter*, to tease. Would it not be better to see here another example of *estordre*, of which *estortre* is a recognized variant?

"Si jo puis ja, vif ne m'estorterez."
Od sun bastun en ad quatre tuez.

The third conjugation future with an analogical *e* is familiar in this poem (cf. ll. 200, 208, 294, etc.).

These are but a few of the remarks which the reading of Dr. Tyler's text suggests. The subject of the composition of the *Chançon* is only casually treated, as might be expected from the general principle adopted of dispensing as far as possible with the display of erudition. Various brief notes call attention to possible *lacunae* and interpolations. The nearest approach to a statement of opinion on the subject of its composition is found in the note on line 1982: "Since Weeks made the suggestion in October, 1905, scholars agree that the older part of the chanson ends here." But if Suchier and Weeks agree with Dr. Tyler upon this point, other scholars view the whole question of the composition of the manuscript quite differently. Since Paul Meyer expressed the opinion that "en réalité il n'y aucune coupure dans le récit au v. 1857 ni aux environs" (*Rom.*, 1903, p. 598), this opinion has not ceased to find champions. Among these are the authors of the two more important articles (The Composition of the *Chançon de Willame* by Hugh A. Smith, *Romanic Review*, 1913, and *La Chanson de Roland et la Chançon de Willame* by M. Wilmotte in *Romania*, 1915) that have appeared since Suchier gave us the excellent bibliography of the *Chançon de Willame* in his edition of 1911, and which we should have been glad to see brought up to date in the volume before us.

The exigencies of the Great War may have prevented Dr. Tyler from providing her text with a fuller vocabulary. If the edition was designed especially for students outside the sphere of Old French, for folk-lorists, for historians seeking a picture of the Middle Ages, for "literary amateurs seeking beautiful poetry, wherever it may be found" (p. ix), as well as for students of Old French who "know probably the vocabulary of a text like Gaston Paris' *Extraits de la Chanson de Roland*" (p. xv), a more complete glossary would seem highly desirable. It might well be undertaken in memory of Dr. Tyler.

LUCY M. GAY.

University of Wisconsin.

Joyce Kilmer: Poems, Essays, and Letters, with a memoir by
ROBERT CORTES HOLLIDAY. New York: George H. Doran
Company, 1919. 2 vols.

The volumes before us are the revelation of an interesting and in some respects an unusual personality. In the outward events of Joyce Kilmer's life there is nothing to mark him off from thousands of young men of literary talent who find a place for themselves in our great metropolitan dailies. After college courses at Rutgers and Columbia, like many another in search of a living, Kilmer taught school for a season and eventually found his way into journalism, where he stayed till the War called him into the service, which, in August, 1918, was ended gloriously by death in action. It was a short, noble, and happy career, but there have been thousands like it in these two years of war.

It is rather in the inner events of Kilmer's life that we find the unusual and the correspondingly interesting. He joined the Roman Catholic communion at the age of twenty-seven, when most men have either become indifferent to the deeper claims of religion or have for some years become fixed in their religious convictions. In Kilmer's case the conversion went down to the very roots of his nature. He suggests the medieval ascetic so that one believes him when he writes to Father Daly: "I wish I had a stern medieval confessor—the sort of person one reads about in the anti-Catholic books—who would inflict real penances. The saying of Holy Marys and Our Fathers is no penance, it's a delight." He believes completely in the objective value of prayer, as "Prayer has given Rose [who was stricken with infantile paralysis and later died] the almost normal use of one arm and the power to sit up. And prayer will do more." One time he narrowly escaped death by trying to pass in front of a moving train, and he writes thus to Father Daly:

"It may interest you to know that I had received the Blessed Sacrament half an hour before the train struck me, and that to this fact I attribute my escape from death—since at this place where I was struck several men have been killed, being thrown forward and under the wheels, instead of (as I was) to one side." One inference from this remarkable statement is that none of those who were killed had partaken of the Sacrament. It is a specimen of reasoning as penetrating as that in which he held that the South was right in the Civil War because it was invaded! The genuine-

ness of his piety, which is, of course, not a matter of reasoning, is shown by the following words from a letter to Sister Emerentia: "Pray that I may love God more. It seems to me that if I can learn to love God more passionately, more constantly, without distraction, that absolutely nothing else can matter. Except while we are in the trenches I receive Holy Communion every morning, so it ought to be easier for me to attain this object of my prayers. I got Faith, you know, by praying for it. I hope to get Love the same way." And yet this genuine piety does not in any way conflict with certain joys of the flesh, for he says to his wife in a letter from France, "I don't want to be an hour's distance from the Biltmore grill and the Knickerbocker bar." And again to the same person he writes, "Well, here are the merriest, bravest drinking places in the world. If the States go dry, I'm going to bundle all you young critters over here to live—a comfortable, humorous, Catholic country."

Kilmer had a healthy love for all that was excellent in life and art and an utter contempt for all that was false and cheap. He despised the erotic and neurotic poets and artists and had small toleration for patriots at home who made a virtue of meatless and wheatless days. He enjoyed everything he did or he made the best of it, as when he wrote of his office work in France: "This is the pleasantest war I ever attended—nothing to do but fall in, fall out, pound a typewriter 13 hours a day and occasionally hike across France and back carrying a piano. However, I really do enjoy it." And when after two months intriguing to get a job that was not so bullet-proof he was attached to the Regimental Intelligence Section as an observer, the post that later brought him death, he said: "Now I am doing the work I love—and work you may be proud of. None of the drudgery of soldiering, but a double share of glory and thrills." Altogether a fine type of American.

The greater part of the second volume is taken up with letters to intimate friends and relatives, and apart from their furnishing a personal record of his thoughts and doings they are of no special interest to the reading public. Like some advertised articles in the "Lost Column" they have no value except to the owner. They are not particularly witty or wise and do not differ essentially from the letters of many another young man with less talent than Kilmer. They are rather disappointing to one who has read and enjoyed his rollicking narrative in *Holy Ireland*, his playful humor

in *A Bouquet for Jenny*, or his delightful satire in *The Inefficient Library*.

Mr. Holliday's characterization of Kilmer as a "belletristic journalist" is, I should say, more correct than his devoted friend and enthusiastic literary executor perhaps intended. The term denotes a journalist with a talent for *belles-lettres*, who writes poetry on the side, not a poet who has taken up journalism for a living. His poems nearly all suggest good newspaper "copy," even *Main Street* and *Trees*, which he said he could "honestly offer . . . to Our Lady, and ask her to present them, as the faithful work of her poor unskilled craftsman, to her Son." The former poem expresses very pleasantly the idea frequently played up in metropolitan verse, reminiscences of the country town of one's boyhood; all very well of its kind, but not a particularly high kind. *Trees*, according to Mr. Holliday, made Kilmer's reputation, and some of the stanzas are excellent. There is genuine feeling for the beauty of trees in

I think that I shall never see
A poem lovely as a tree; . . .
A tree that looks to God all day,
And lifts her leafy arms to pray; . . .
Upon whose bosom snow has lain;
Who intimately lives with rain.

But what shall we say of this stanza with a figure which surely does not suggest a tree to one's imagination?—

A tree whose hungry mouth is prest
Against the earth's sweet flowing breast;—

or of this one which has a figure which is decidedly unpleasant to a mind with somewhat earthly association?—

A tree that may in summer wear
A nest of robins in her hair.

But, of course, a rime was necessary.

One of the poems most justly praised is *The White Ships and the Red*, memorializing the sinking of the *Lusitania*, though it, too, was newspaper "copy." It voices the deep indignation not merely of the poet but of the nation, and in this is its merit. The other poems do not dig deep into life; they are the work of a man who has had no great experience. His war poems are too near the

event to be a concentration of what he had gone through, an expression of emotion recollected in tranquillity. His *Rouge Bouquet* is good, but there are hundreds just as good and many better. Perhaps if he had lived—and of how many may this be said, Seeger, Brooke, Ledwidge, and the rest—he would have fulfilled his own prophecy: "The only sort of book I care to write about the war is the sort people will read after the war is over! It will be episodic—chaotic, perhaps—no glib tale, no newspaper man's work—but with God's help, a work of art."

And in the end one can but say that the more one reads Kilmer's poems and letters and occasional pieces the more one admires the man, a fine manly type representing the best element in the A. E. F. There is not a word of complaint, not a note of pessimism, not a sign of fear; just sheer joy in his work and only sympathy for those who could not share his joy. For all this we are grateful to Mr. Holliday, who has executed his trust well.

JAMES W. TUPPER.

Lafayette College.

CORRESPONDENCE

NOTES ON THE METAPHYSICAL POETS

DONNE (1). A very definite allusion to the poetry of John Donne in the first canto of Butler's *Hudibras* seems hitherto to have escaped the notice of editors of both poets. In Part 1, Canto 1, 649-650, occurs the parenthetical remark,

As we find in sullen writs,
And cross-grained works of modern wits. . . .

The reference is, of course, to Donne's *Progress of the Soul*, of which the last stanza begins thus:

Who ere thou beest that read'st this sullen Writ,
Which just so much courts thee as thou dost it.¹

It is amusing, by the way, to note the explanation Warburton furnished for Zachary Grey's edition of *Hudibras*: "*sullen writs*. For Satirical Writings, well expressed, as implying, That such Writers as *Withers*, *Pryn*, and *Vicars* had no more than Ill-nature towards making a Satyrists."² This is about on Warburton's usual critical

¹ Grierson's edition, I, 315.

² Grey's *Hudibras*, ed. 1772, I, 70.

level, but it is only fair to recall that in the preface to his edition of Shakespeare, many years later, Warburton³ expressed a doubt whether in any learned language there had ever appeared "so execrable a heap of nonsense as the Grey edition of *Hudibras*!"⁴

DONNE (2). Donne's epigram upon an antiquary runs as follows:

If in his Studie he hath so much care
To hang all old strange things, let his wife beware.⁵

This may have suggested two lines in Dryden's *Upon the Death of Lord Hastings* (83-84),

Time's offals, only fit for the hospital!
Or to hang an antiquary's rooms withal.

CAREW. Professor Saintsbury, in his *Caroline Poets*, I (310), quotes from Edward Benlowes' *Theophila* (1652) as follows:

Betimes, when keen-breath'd winds, with frosty cream,
Periwig bald trees, glaze tattling stream. . . .

and adds in a note, "Of course Benlowes, though he added the absurdity of 'cream,' borrowed this from the famous locus of Sylvester which Dryden ridicules." A reference to the Dryden passage—p. 227 in the Scott-Saintsbury edition—will justify the main point of this remark. But it is not equally clear that Benlowes invented the "frosty cream." Twelve years earlier Carew, in *The Spring*, had written

no more the frost
Candies the grass, or casts an icy cream
Upon the silver lake or crystal stream.

DRYDEN (1). The much-ridiculed lines in Dryden's *Upon the Death of Lord Hastings*—

Each little pimple had a tear in it
To wail the fault its rising did commit,

are likely to be a reminiscence of stanza 70 of George Herbert's *The Church Porch*, which has these lines,—

In time of service seal up both thine eyes
And send them to thy heart: that spying sin
They may weep out the stains by them did rise.

DRYDEN (2). The second stanza of Dryden's *To the Pious Memory of the accomplished young lady Mrs Anne Killigrew* runs in part, thus:

But if thy pre-existing soul
Was formed at first, with myriads more,
It did through all the mighty poets roll

³ Preface, *ad fin.*

⁴ Grey's *Hudibras* had been published three years earlier.

⁵ Grierson's ed., I, 77.

And was that Sappho last which once it was before—
If so, then cease thy flight, O heaven-born mind!
Thou hast no dross to purge from thy rich ore.

An interesting parallel, if not a source, is Martial's address to Sulpicia, a Roman Anne Killigrew (XI, 6), in which the poet thus apostrophizes Sappho:

hac condiscipula vel hac magistra,
esses doctior et pudica, Sappho.

BUTLER. The familiar lines in *Hudibras* (Part 1, Canto 1, 165-6),

As if Divinity had catch'd,
The Itch, on purpose to be scratch'd,

may be an echo of the famous epigram, *Disputandi pruritus ecclesiarum scabies*. This saying has been ascribed to Sir Henry Wotton, upon whose tombstone it appears, with the assertion, *Hic jacet huius sententiae primus auctor*. Izaak Walton, who relates the circumstance, seems a little uneasy as to the accuracy of the statement, but makes the delightful apology that if Sir Henry did make a mistake on this point, it was because his mind "was then so fixed on that part of the communion of saints which is above, that an holy lethargy did surprise his memory."⁶

BEN. C. CLOUGH.

"FULL MANY A GEM"

Was Thomas Gray acquainted with the *Iter Boreale* of R. Wild, D.D. (1671)? This curious little volume of poems contains (p. 102) a poem from Mr. Nathan Wanley to Dr. Wild. Mr. Wanley reproaches his friend for hiding his light under a bushel, and says

So the bright taper useless burns
To private and recluded Urns,
So Pearls themselves to shells confine
And Gems in the Sea's bottom shine,
As thou my WILD while thou dost lie
Huddled up in thy privacy.

Dr. Wild is at all events not too reticent to give us an illuminating and frank picture of a poet in his workshop; on p. 117, in the midst of a funeral elegy, he admonishes himself thus,

I must be in a Rapture—not to be
Distracted is below his memory.

The rest of the poem is "distracted" enough to please the most exacting deceased person.

Readville, Mass.

BEN. C. CLOUGH.

⁶ *Walton's Lives: Sir Henry Wotton.*

SWINBURNE'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO *The Spectator* IN 1862

Between April and September 1862 Swinburne published in *The Spectator*, besides a number of prose articles, seven poems that were afterwards included in *Poems and Ballads*, 1866. It seems to have been generally assumed that the 1862 text of this group of poems is identical with the text of 1866, the more especially because Swinburne, in this unlike Wordsworth, Tennyson and other poets, very seldom altered in any way a poem once it was published. The only noteworthy exceptions to his custom in this matter, besides those to be considered here, are the short piece *Pastiche* and the "Prelude" and first canto of *Tristram of Lyonesse*—the text-variants of which poems may properly form the subject of a separate note. With regard to the *Spectator* poems, the text of only three—*Before Parting*, *A Song in Time of Revolution*, and *August*—remained unchanged. One—*After Death*—contains no alteration except that the questions that the second and third boards of the coffin ask are interchanged. The original text of the other three differs materially from that finally adopted. *A Song in Time of Order* (in the issue of April 26) contains eleven stanzas only instead of fourteen, those omitted (ix, x, and xiii) alluding to the red flag of revolution, to Pius IX, to "Buonaparte the bastard," to the atrocities of Cayenne, and to "Austrian whips." Thus emasculated, the *Spectator* text is more vague in its republicanism and in its advocacy of Tyranicide and is considerably less "dangerous." *Faustine*, one of the pieces that gave greatest offence in 1866, was printed in the issue of May 31, 1862 without rebuke from the critics but with the significant omission of stanza xxxiii ("What sterile growths," etc.) with its allusions to perverse passion. Evidently Richard Holt Hutton was exercising, and Swinburne was submitting to, a political and moral censorship. *The Sundew* (published July 26, 1862) contains the following stanza, here reprinted for the first time, in place of stanzas iii and iv of the final version:

"Stoop with drawn brows against the sun,
Crawl close and peer across bowed knees;
The weal growth ripens and gets ease
Till August weathers leave undone
The apple-coloured cranberries."

Besides these seven poems Swinburne contributed several prose critiques to *The Spectator* at this time. One, the short letter in defence of Meredith's *Modern Love*, was signed; one, the review of *Les Fleurs du Mal*, has been long known to be by him; while five articles on Hugo's *Les Misérables* were identified as Swinburne's by Mr. Gosse, partly on internal evidence, partly on the testimony of private letters, and have been privately printed by Mr. T. J. Wise though they have not yet been republished. In his *Life of Swinburne* (p. 88) Mr. Gosse writes: "There are several others which I

am privately certain are also Swinburne's, but I deprecate mere conjecture, and will not name them." The evidence of Swinburne's early style is so convincing that I am willing to risk conjecture. I seem to see his hand in several, but only of one article am I positive that it must be by him. This is a notice of "Mrs. Browning's Last Poems" in the issue of March 29, 1862. Such phrase as "The impulse of her eager and rich imagination in an age of pale thoughts and weak instincts" or "The vanishing of a genuine poetic force in this languid and pallid mental world" bear Swinburne's sign manual upon them. The review contains a brief suggestive passage on the contrast between the superficiality of feeling and the profundity of imagination. Mrs. Browning, the writer says—and again the turn of thought is Swinburne's—"yields herself almost with the lashed fury of a Pythoness" to feeling; we see her on the surface of it; she seldom penetrates beneath to the sphere of imagination. A notice of Sir Henry Taylor's *St. Clement's Eve* and one of Christina Rossetti's *Goblin Market* are much in his manner; that both poets were among those whom Swinburne delighted to honor makes his authorship the more likely. I am more uncertain about two notices of Clough's work. But is not Swinburne's voice heard in the following protest, in the course of a notice of Richard Garnett's *Relics of Shelley* (in the issue of August 2), against the publication of scattered scraps of Shelley's writing?

"There is, we feel, far more pain in the sense of mutilation which such passages produce—the sense of a broken melody—than pleasure in the occasional gleam of Shelley's genius which remains there; for the breathless continuity of his song, which rolls onward to the end without rest or pause, was of the true essence of Shelley's genius, and to have shattered fragments of his music is like listening to a stammering lark."

Whether these identifications be accepted unreservedly or not, it is quite evident that in order to make his forthcoming *Bibliography of Swinburne* quite exhaustive Mr. T. J. Wise will do well to examine the columns of *The Spectator* of 1862 with the most painstaking attention.

SAMUEL C. CHEW.

Bryn Mawr College.

ONE-DOOR INTERIORS ON THE ELIZABETHAN STAGE

In a recent number of *Modern Philology* (May 1919, vol. XVII, no. 1) Mr. George Fullmer Reynolds, whose researches into the principles of Elizabethan staging are always full of interest, publishes an enquiry into "Two conventions of the Elizabethan stage." One passage of this article may serve as the text of a brief note. Mr. Reynolds writes:—

"On the Elizabethan stage, as we usually picture it, at least two doors are always visible, and when the rear stage curtains are opened at least three; but there are several scenes in Elizabethan plays in which the audience is asked to imagine that but one door leads to the stage."

Every word of this is demonstrably true, but there is an implication which is false. When Mr. Reynolds speaks of the stage "as we usually picture it," he is thinking of the reconstructions made by those who first misinterpreted and then scoffed at the direct evidence of Van Buchell's sketch of the Swan. In *The Book of Homage to Shakespeare*, I tried to show that the preponderance of evidence indicated that the tiring-house (*i. e.* tiring-room, upper stage, music-room, and so-called "hut") projected upon the stage, and was a structure of equal width from top to bottom, though in front its upper stories probably overlapped the lower. I believe, however, that I did not rightly explain Van Buchell's visible doors. De Witt had certainly attempted to show two sides of the tiring-house, as he saw them, with one door in each—that is so say, one in the front of the house and the other in the side, one opening upon the front stage and the other upon one of the lateral passages. He did not represent a third door, simply because it was on the other side of the tiring-house and could not be seen from his point of view. But Van Buchell supposed erroneously that the lower stories presented a front which stretched right across the stage, and he consequently shows us the two doors side by side.

If we ignore the modern elaborations of Van Buchell's unfortunate misconception, the convention to which Mr. Reynolds draws attention in the passage I have quoted becomes more easily intelligible. When the front stage was regarded as a room, it was easy enough to treat the one door in the front of the tiring-house as the only entrance to that room.

J. LEROY BRERETON.

University of Sydney.

ELIZABETHAN 'NOCTURNAL' AND 'INFERNAL' PLAYS

In a recently published lecture¹ Mr. W. J. Lawrence cites evidence which indicates the existence of two hitherto unrecognized types of Elizabethan drama: the 'infernal' and 'nocturnal.' He finds mention of the former in *Histrionastix* (1598?), of the latter in *Histrionastix* and in Dekker's *Seven Deadly Sins of London* (1606). Mr. Lawrence then proceeds to define the probable nature of the Nocturnal, and to list as examples of it the following plays: Haughton's *Englishmen for my Money*, Porter's *Two Angry Women of Abingdon*, the 'pseudo-Shakespearean' *Merry Devil of*

¹"Shakespeare from a New Angle," in the *Dublin Studies*, September 1919, pages 442-455.

Edmonton, and Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Merry Wives of Windsor*.

In support of Mr. Lawrence's thesis I would call attention to several further allusions in Dekker's pamphlets, which seem to add validity to his conclusions. Mr. Lawrence diffidently concedes in regard to the term 'Infernal' that 'no other known instance of the use of the technicality has come down to us,' beyond that in *Histrionastix* and the phrase 'Infernall musicke' in Marston's *Wonder of Women* (Act iv). Dekker, however, appears distinctly to mention the type when he says in his *News from Hell* (*The Devil's Answer to Pierce Penniless*, 1606):

'Yet some pittifull fellows (that haue faces like fire-drakes, but wittes colde as Whetstones, and more blunt) not Poets indeede, but ballad-makers, rub out there, and write Infernals' (Grosart, ii. 99). Later in the same work he says of Cerberus: 'No, no, this doorekeeper wayts not to take money of those that passe in, to behold the *Infernall Tragedyes*. . . .' (Grosart, ii, 124).

In *Work for Armorers* (1609) Dekker has a passage about the plague which seems to depend for its interpretation upon a recognized subdivision of the drama into Tragedies, Comedies, and Nocturnals:

'The *Players* themselues did neuer worke till now, there *Comedies* are all turned to *Tragedies*, there *Tragedies* to *Nocturnals*, and the best of them all are weary of playing in those *Nocturnal Tragedies*.' (Grosart, iv. 96).

Mr. Lawrence's treatment of the 'Nocturnal' is rich in suggestion concerning the purposes and methods of Elizabethan playwrights. An investigation of the 'Infernal' type might also explain a number of apparently purposeless scenes and episodes in plays of the time. One thinks at once of Miles in Greene's *Friar Bacon* riding to Hell on the Devil's back, of the Induction to *The Merry Devil of Edmonton*, and of several scenes in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* (both versions) and Barnes's *Devil's Charter*.

TUCKER BROOKE.

Yale University.

KIPLING AND ARIOSTO

In the eternal search for parallels, analogues, origins, etc., someone may stumble—as did I—upon the interesting parallel of phrasing and idea given here; and may insist upon doing what I refuse to do,—that is, trying to claim for one quotation the parentage of the other. Let common origin of not unfamiliar ideas be the solution.

Kipling's Tommy Atkins defends himself from too harsh judgments by saying

(We're) . . . single men in barricks, most remarkable like you;
 An' if sometimes our conduct isn't all your fancy paints,
 Why, single men in barricks don't grow into plaster saints.

Now when Ariosto wrote his *Satira VI, ad Annibale Malaguzzo, sul Matrimonio* (1525) he merely said

Non pote uom in bontade esser perfetto

and this, in the not widely known English translation of the Satires, brought out by Temple Henry Croker (1759), becomes Kipling's parallel in

Whatever legends feign or preachers paint,
 A single man's bad stuff to make a saint. (ll. 19-20)

The unidentified Mr. H——n to whom the vagrant and mercenary Irish editor assigns the translation of this particular Satire seems interested in real rather than plaster appearance of holiness, it is true, but even so, the verbal kinship of the passages is interesting without being of great importance.

Columbia University.

GILBERT W. MEAD.

BRIEF MENTION

The Measures of the Poets: A New System of English Prosody. By M. A. Bayfield (Cambridge, At the University Press, 1919). "Sidney Lanier [in his book "published some forty years ago," which "unfortunately I did not hear of until the present work was written"] advocated the trochaic base for our lyrics, but strangely enough retained the iambic base for blank verse. English books on the subject still continue to adopt the iambic base, even for lyrics, and accordingly the system put forth in these pages is, so far as the systems in vogue are concerned, altogether revolutionary" . . . "For while the system generally received and taught, which is founded on the traditional iambic base, can readily be shown to rest on radical misconceptions of the whole matter and to break down at every turn when tested by the work of the poets, with the adoption of the trochaic base, as here proposed, every feature and variation of the verse is seen to have arisen naturally and easily, and nothing is left unexplained." In these statements, in the form of a preface, the author's purpose in publishing this book (kept within the limits of 112 pages) is clearly announced. Mr. Bayfield's experience in the use of words warrants the reader now to expect the employment of an accurate, scientific method both in defining the "misconceptions of the whole matter" to which the traditional acceptance of the 'iambic base' is declared to be due, and in demonstrating the validity of the assumption that the trochee is the basic foot in English versification. The expectant reader of Mr. Bayfield's 'revolutionary' discussion will, however, experience no slight degree of disappointment.

By direct assertion Mr. Bayfield communicates the hypothesis for his *a priori* argument from the practice of the poets. Thus, "The normal foot of our verse, $\acute{\text{v}}$, is called a *trochee*; it is to be noted that the stressed syllable comes first. The combination $\text{v} \acute{\text{v}}$, which cannot form a metrical foot, because the stressed syllable does not come first, is called an *iambus*" (p. 2). "*Trochee* . . . , the staple foot of the bulk of English verse. . . . *Iambus*, $\text{v} \acute{\text{v}}$. This is not used as a metrical foot in English" (p. 5). It is, however, acknowledged that this fundamental assumption has been suggested by the notation of music: "When music was first marked off in bars (in the 16th century), the principle instinctively adopted was to begin each bar with a stressed note; and this would seem to be the natural mode of division, although many musical themes begin with a note that is not accented. Considering the close analogy between music and verse, to mark off the units of a verse measure otherwise would therefore seem to be as *un-natural* as it would be to divide the notes of a waltz into bars each of which began with the third beat" (p. 34).

One might let the whole matter rest with what has been cited from Mr. Bayfield's paragraphs. These citations disclose an attitude of mind that does not lead one to expect anything new or 'revolutionary' that is also convincing. But Mr. Bayfield's strong emphasis on the newness of his point of view is not sufficiently modified by his references to Schmidt's theory of the antique rhythms or to the treatise by Lanier. At all events one is not prepared for the absence of a consideration of the tradition to which Mr. Saintsbury gives attention in his excursus "on the point whether the iamb or the trochee is really the staple foot of English poetry," promised in his *Hist. of Engl. Prosody*, II (1908), p. viii, and then published in the third volume of that work (Appendix II). In this connection one recalls Aristotle's interest in the question concerning the basic foot of Greek: "The heroic rhythm is too dignified [for prose], and is deficient in conversational harmony. The iambic rhythm, on the other hand, is the very diction of ordinary life, and is therefore of all metres the most frequent in conversation; but it is deficient in dignity and impressiveness. The trochaic rhythm approximates too much to broad comedy, as appears in trochaic tetrameters; for the tetrameter is a tripping rhythm" (*Rhet.*, III, chap. viii; Welldon's translation). Dionysius of Halicarnassus (chap. xvii) also recognized the difference in movement between iambic and trochaic rhythms. In his judgment, the iambic rhythm is 'not ignoble'; the trochaic rhythm is 'less manly, more ignoble.'

Mr. Bayfield is not concerned with the fundamental inquiry as to the 'natural' predominance of a certain rhythm in English. He does not ask the question whether the language runs most acceptably in this or that rhythm, a question that is answered by

the character of the language and the long tradition of its acceptable versification. Disregarding the linguistic argument and denying the evidence of national tradition, he simply adopts a late device in musical notation, and Hartmann's new term *anacrusis* as the key that releases all secrets, and declares that he has thereby arrived at the "trochaic scheme" as the "strictly indispensable requisite for any prosodic scheme—*continuity of rhythm*." The implication that iambic meters are subversive of continuity of rhythm is, to say the least, startling. Because of the fascination of prosodic theories, some will be persuaded by Mr. Bayfield's contention,—no heresy has yet failed to win adherents. He is already numbering some four unnamed—they will probably remain unnamed—poets. But he will not lay under a spell the well-grounded inquirer into the principles of versification, who is always prepared to be charmed by an additional ray of light upon truth. Noteworthy is the reaction of Mr. Saintsbury, in *The Athenaeum* for Nov. 7 (see also Mr. Bayfield's letter, in the same periodical for Nov. 21, and Mr. Saintsbury's final utterance, the expression of an almost impatient and certainly uncompromising finality, a week later).

When a verse is said to be, for example, an iambic pentameter, it is meant that the rhythm, as determined by the meter, is iambic. However, it has come to be usual to use the terms rhythm and meter interchangeably to designate the movement of a verse. Aristotle is exact in defining meter as the marking off of the sections of rhythm. But Mr. Bayfield insists on a difference between rhythm and meter that disunites them in a way that contradicts the fundamental principle of rhythm. There is no law of rhythm that requires the wave of movement to begin only or even most frequently at a crest. In the notation of music the bar does not signify that music is prevaillingly trochaic-anapestic in movement. Mr. Bayfield commits the error of assuming that a merely graphic, external device in one art conditions in another art an inner and vital law, and extenuates his error by denying the relation between rhythm and meter.

There has been good ground for believing that no editor of Chaucer (after Skeat's gradual conversion) or of Shakespeare would now hesitate in accepting two important features of iambic measures, namely, the occasional use of the 'direct attack' ($\angle | \times \angle$) and of the trochaic beginning ($\angle \times \angle$). But Mr. Bayfield, with surprising indifference to an achieved result, attempts to overturn the whole tradition of English versification by assuming, on the evidence of these occasional beginnings, that all so-called iambic lines are trochaic in meter, tho usually mixed in rhythm. The 'direct attack' in blank verse produces, in his judgment, pure trochaic lines. He counts 66 occurrences in Marlowe's seven plays and "in all Shakespeare's 176." That many of these lines have a vocative or exclamatory beginning is not considered:

Hear you, master steward, where's our master?
 Come, good fellow, put mine iron on.
 O this learning, what a thing it is!
 Grace go with you, Benedicite!
 Out, you rogue, you pluck my foot awry.

Normally, it is admitted, the line (in blank verse) has an upbeat, which is, however, structurally hypermetric, an anacrusis. But this upbeat is omitted at the convenience of the poet; sometimes for an emphasis on the first word, tho "often there is no emphasis at all there." The trochaic beginning (here scanned $\angle \times \times | \angle$) is the result:

Shook, but delayed to strike though oft invoked
 Roaring, and all the wave was in a flame
 Swifter than dreams the white flown feet of sleep

The trochaic beginning (properly scanned $\angle \times | \times \angle$) has a fixed place in the long tradition of the iambic line, but the secondary accents and the accents of connective and relational words reduce the usually assumed number of occurrences. Of all this Mr. Bayfield says nothing. For him, "when the upbeat is wanting, in our measure, the first foot is almost always resolved" ($\angle \times \times$).

For the most part Mr. Bayfield scans according to his conception of the prose-emphasis of the line, but even in this matter sense must often be sacrificed to the trochaic hypothesis. The liberties taken with rhythm in upholding the theory are also augmented in a peculiar adoption of 'resolution' and of a foot of one syllable. Thus, by 'resolving' the second foot the 'traditional' iambic pentameter becomes identical with the *Phalæcean* meter; and it becomes identical with a Sapphic line when the resolution is in the third foot:

Hé that | párts us shall | bríng a | bránd from | heaven
 Whát may | yóu be? | Áre you of | góod or | évil

Warning is given that "a resolution may easily escape notice," as in

O : this is the | *poíson* of | *déep* | *gríef*; it | *spríngs*

Here, however, the true resolution is in the thesis of the second iamb (*is the poi-*), there is, of course, no anacrusis, and the monosyllabic foot is inadmissible. Strangely, Mr. Bayfield has not inferred from the notation of music that an arsis or a thesis may be broken into two parts together equivalent to the required rhythmic note.

The monosyllabic foot is defined as either "a stressed syllable protracted to the time-value of a whole foot, usually for emphasis, but not always," or, "a stressed syllable followed by a pause."

It is "usually followed or preceded by a resolved foot in order to ease the rhythm, but in Shakespeare a monosyllabic 4th foot is quite common." A few illustrative lines render comment redundant:

Are of | *two* | houses: | lawful | mercy
 The : very | *stones* | prate of my | wherea | bouts
 Not : cast a | side so | soon.—Was the | *hope* | drunk
 Where : in you | dress'd your | self? hath it | *sleep* | since?

Holding that rhythm and scansion (meter) do not necessarily coincide, or rather that rhythm, which in Mr. Bayfield's mind is emphasis, would be falsified by straightforward scansion (p. 28), he gains the right to admit an iambic movement in a trochaic measure, and especially to unite the two movements within the limits of a line. His disapproval of "an unbroken iambic or an unbroken trochaic rhythm all through" a line (p. 26) has led him to adopt the monosyllabic foot with its usually supporting resolution. The disclosure of method in his dealing with it will surely excuse the citation of a line that has become hackneyed in prosodic discussion:

To : be, or | not to | be, \wedge || that is the | question

"The *rhythm* of the first six words," he declares, "as distinct from their scansion, is iambic, but this disappears after the monosyllabic foot, and we have the rhythm $\acute{u} \acute{u} \acute{u} | \angle \acute{u} ||$."

In this admission of a change from one rhythm to another within the same line, Mr. Bayfield's subjectivity mounts to its most preposterous pitch. For the present, one may be content to add nothing to Mr. Saintsbury's comment.

If it may be granted that a sufficiently clear view of the dominant doctrine set forth in this treatise has now been given, the purpose of this notice has been accomplished. The author's evaluation of various kinds of metrical units and his scansion of lyric measures would remain to be discussed, if his primary assumptions could be regarded as being somewhat less than fundamentally untenable. Presumably Mr. Bayfield has "A mind not to be changed by time or place" and will before long publish, as announced, *A Study of Shakespeare's Versification*. That may provide an occasion to make amends for the incompleteness of the present comments.

J. W. B.

Professor Percy H. Boynton's *American Poetry* (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918) is a gratifying addition to the still somewhat scanty list of American anthologies. It is a generous collection of nearly six hundred double-column pages of verse, selected with two main purposes: to represent the progress of

American poetry and American thought, and to indicate the chief characteristics of the various authors. To further the first of these purposes the editor has included, along with selections from the twenty-five poets who are specially represented, four time-groups of fugitive poems of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and lyrics of the Revolutionary and Civil Wars. For the same purpose the order of chronology is so far neglected as to bring together the verse of Whittier, Lowell, the Civil War lyricists, Timrod, and Hayne, and to place Longfellow and Holmes after these poets.

The second purpose requires the inclusion of a sufficient number of the poems of each author to make clear the variety of his work and the development of his art. Unfortunately such a method of selection does not always best represent the literature as a whole or best meet the needs of those teachers to whom the study of American literature is not merely or primarily the study of American men of letters. It is a method which seems to require, for instance, that poems too long to be printed entire must be represented by extracts. And the making of such extracts is always a thankless task. In the case of *Hiawatha* it is not impossible to choose satisfactory excerpts; but *Evangeline* and *The Courtship of Miles Standish* suffer so greatly by abridgement that they had better be omitted altogether. Whittier's *Snow-Bound* is particularly disappointing in this volume. The omission of lines 175-211 does not, to be sure, retard the story; but the story is written around those lines. The student who fails to read them misses the fact that the poem is Whittier's *In Memoriam*. The same criticism applies to *Sir Launfal*. By general consent the parable is the least valuable part of that uneven poem, and the nature-poetry through which Lowell finds his way to the theme is the most valuable. Why, then, for the sake of the story omit the poetry? Or why not omit altogether a poem that could so easily be spared to make room for others? For there are always other poets who deserve admission to an anthology. One misses Taylor and Aldrich of the Metropolitan group, for example, and regrets the absence of Emily Dickinson and such blithe spirits as Bunner and Eugene Field.

The critical comments, which are the work of several editors, are on the whole just and helpful. That is all the more reason why slips like *The Baltimore Saturday Victor* (p. 638) for *The Baltimore Saturday Visiter* and "The present writer cannot but help thinking" should not appear in them. In the text of the poems and in the Index of Subjects there are misprints and typographical errors—such, for example, as p. 133, l. 237, bill for fill; p. 235, l. 351, Those for Whose; p. 234, l. 28 Lenore! for Lenore? l. 57, further for farther; and the incorrect indexing of Timrod's *Ethnogenesis* and *The Cotton Boll*, p. 704, and Lowell's *Columbus*, p. 705. These make an early revision of this useful and timely work desirable.

J. C. F.

Astronomical Lore in Chaucer. By Florence M. Grimm (University of Nebraska Studies in Language, Literature and Criticism, No. 2, Lincoln, 1919). This interesting little monograph makes a bold attempt to deal with the complicated subject of Chaucer's working knowledge of what he presents in theory in the *Astrolabe*. From its first chapter and from its treatment of such topics as the Harmony of the Spheres one might guess that it was written as a convenient manual for the beginner in the Chaucerian field. Much of the material is a résumé of scholarly opinion (for which closer references might well have been given) or an interpretative collection of Chaucer's own allusions. From this point of view, although it might be wise to exclude a reference to theories such as that of the identification of "Louis" (p. 28) with the son of Clifford (see *Mod. Philol.* xiv, pp. 513 ff.), it would have been better to devote the introduction to a review of the knowledge of the subject which is revealed by Chaucer's immediate predecessors or contemporaries. How much, for instance, was available in the discussions of the Seven Liberal Arts, or in the work of Bartholomew Anglicus (known to many and translated by Trevisa)? How well did Chaucer's information compare with that of Lydgate? One statement is made: "Throughout the long dark centuries of the Middle Ages it survived in the studies of the retired students of the monasteries and of the few exceptionally enlightened men who still had some regard for pagan learning" (p. 6). But one suspects that this view needs correction, both in regard to the darkness of the centuries and the numbers of the enlightened men.

There are some unfortunate deficiencies in the material dealt with. The discussion of the *Almagest* (p. 10, n. 1) might have been helped by consulting Miss Hammond's bibliography. One hardly cites Rambeau (p. 12) without reservations. The confusion of planets and deities is common in allegory of the period (see p. 69, n. 3). The discussion of Venus (pp. 45 ff.) might have included matters touched on by Professor Tupper (*N. Y. Nation*, xcvi, 354 ff.). It might have been difficult to do more with the *Complaint of Mars* as an astronomical *tour de force*, or with the "north-north-west" of the *Parlement*, but some reference to these problems might have been made with advantage. The analysis of the fatalism in Chaucer's characters is only as unsatisfactory as its brevity might lead one to expect; possible change or growth in Chaucer's views is not hinted at. As a contribution, therefore, the study is not all that might be desired, but it breaks the ground for a broader survey and it brings together many of the important points which must be considered. Typographical errors appear at the bottom of page 8, and the last two lines of note 3, p. 32.

H. R. P.